JPRS 83484

17 May 1983

USSR Report

HUMAN RESOURCES

No. 84

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS REPORTS

Japan Report
Korean Affairs Report
Southeast Asia Report
Mongolia Report

Near East/South Asia Report
Sub-Saharan Africa Report
West Europe Report
West Europe Report: Science and Technology
Latin America Report

USSR

Political and Sociological Affairs
Problems of the Far East
Science and Technology Policy
Sociological Studies
Translations from KOMMUNIST
USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology
World Economy and International Relations
Agriculture
Construction and Related Industries
Consumer Goods and Domestic Trade
Economic Affairs
Energy
Human Resources
International Economic Relations
Transportation

Physics and Mathmetics
Space
Space Biology and Aerospace Medicine
Military Affairs
Chemistry
Cybernetics, Computers and Automation Technology
Earth Sciences
Electronics and Electrical Engineering
Engineering and Equipment
Machine Tools and Metal-Working Equipment
Life Sciences: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences
Life Sciences: Effects of Nonionizing Electromagnetic Radiation
Materials Science and Metallurgy

EASTERN EUROPE

Political, Sociological and Military Affairs
Scientific Affairs

Economic and Industrial Affairs

CHINA

Political, Sociological and Military Affairs
Economic Affairs
Science and Technology

RED FLAG
Agriculture
Plant and Installation Data

WORLDWIDE

Telecommunications Policy, Research and Development
Nuclear Development and Proliferation

Environmental Quality
Epidemiology

FBIS DAILY REPORT

China
Soviet Union
South Asia
Asia and Pacific

Eastern Europe
Western Europe
Latin America
Middle East and Africa

To order, see inside front cover

JPRS 83484

17 May 1983

USSR REPORT

HUMAN RESOURCES

No. 84

CONTENTS

GENERAL

LABOR

SIBERIAN ECONOMIST COMMENTS ON BRIGADE LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Jan 83 p 3

/Report on the difficulties of the new form of labor organization, by Novosibirsk Economist B. Kutyrev: "Round the Brigade"/

/Text/ "Today I am speaking to you at a regular scientific-practical conference dedicated to brigade labor organization. There have been quite a few such conferences, yet today there are no empty seats in the spacious hall. There are many familiar faces, and interest is unflagging.

A Formula for Parity, or "Wage Equalization"

"Awaiting my turn to speak, I listen to the speakers and observe the reaction of the audience. Now a brigade leader is speaking. He describes the success achieved by virtue of 'collectivization'. Right away there are several questions put to him: Are auxiliary workers part of the brigade; why isn't skill-category taken into consideration everywhere in determining the collective wages; are the brigade members' working conditions different?

"What is remarkable in the audience reaction? On the one hand, there is the desire to find out just how to organize work in accordance with the new form of stimulus and organization of labor. Those who report on the specifics receive careful attention: things are jotted down in notebooks, and the questions pour forth. Experience is given very high value, especially that which is printed up in some kind of instruction or other: all kinds of 'regulations' are in great demand—on the status of a brigade; on the rights of a brigade leader, a brigade soviet and the like. They go like hotcakes, as they say. This is fine, as long as they treat this experience critically and with care. But if not?

"At the rostrum is a brigade leader who describes how they utilize the Labor Participation Factor (KTU) /Koeffitsient trudovogo uchastiya/. They took as their basis one of the standard recommendations. But did they act properly?

"A brief, and very general sketch of the method of calculation looks like this: there are four workers in the brigade—A, B, C and D. At the beginning of the month they establish an identical initial factor for them—the numeral one, which is completely fair. According to the totals of a work day,

week or month, the figure is corrected by means of rising (plus) or falling (minus) marks. But it is here that some doubts arise: and to what extent are these minuses fair? After all, this is nothing but a kind of fine. And for what?

"An enthusiastic supporter of the brigade organization from Sayanogorsk tells of an experiment with 'brigade profits' or, to put it another way, with the increase in economic independence at the lowest production cell. He tells specifically how the workers treat the plan for distributing wages acording to KTU. It turns out that 0.2 was added to A, having taken this factor away from B. And 0.1 was added to C, having taken it from D... I beg your pardon, but this is a violation of the socialist principle of distribution. If one judges from a socialist point of view, then A, B, C and D should receive that which each of them contributed. But when the principle operates where 'one is taken from the other', one can no longer speak of the brigade as a united socialist production cell. No wonder that there are 'brigades' in which they believe that the more shirkers there are the better: their minuses (demerits) are pluses for the remaining members, and the money not earned by the shirkers is divided among the rest.

"The moral costs of such distribution are clearly realized in many collectives. And in certain brigades they reject it, preferring wage equality in distribution of earnings. And today at the conference one of the brigade leaders shares his experience on this matter. And he explains it like this: inasmuch as we are a team, we all put our utmost into our work. Consequently, no such factors for setting one apart from the others are required.

"I look around the hall: someone or other nods, poised to write it down, in order to utilize it at home. Others shake their heads doubtfully: that may be true; but, nevertheless in achieving the final result, the contribution of every member of the brigade is different. Can one find its value according to a formula for wage equalization? One cannot. A differentiated approach is required. What kind? According to the above-mentioned 'A gets 1.2, and B gets 0.8'? Judging from the reaction of the participants at the conference this formula is a popular one. One hears again and again, 'And what sort of minus factor do you set for absenteeism? And what sort of plus factor do you assign for higher skills?' My answer and my advice to them: Don't rush, and give some thought to the social consequences of this experience; does it not conceal within itself a distortion of the idea of the collective form of stimulus and organization of labor in socialist production?

Leaning on One's Shoulder or Hiding Behind One's Back

"One often hears from enterprise managers, 'With today's shortage of personnel just try to force someone to join a brigade—they quit right there!' I recall one incident from practical experience. A young worker from another Barnaul industrial enterprise arrived at the fuel equipment shop at the Altay engine building association. In answer to the question, why did he quit, he didn't want to answer and set only one condition—send him to a sector where there are no brigades. And they found him such a sector in the fuel equipment shop. They are also found for others who for some reason don't want to work in a collective. But why don't they want to? They don't

for example, want to 'work upon' others who are trying to hide behind someone else. They don't want to take responsibility for them. Some don't like the increased intensiveness of labor, which is incompatible with the increase in wages, or the more severe labor discipline. And inasmuch as joining a brigade is a voluntary matter, the way out is self-evident: I think I'd rather go to another shop or to another plant!

"Introducing new forms of stimulus and organization of labor is not a simple matter, and without the necessary preparation it is even dangerous: one can alienate people and even discredit the very idea of the brigade contract. There are no trifles here. Let's take, for example, the question of the size of a brigade. Frequently they try to find some sort of optimal size 'in general'—15, 20 or 25 people, and so on. But is this right? After all there is no such thing as a brigade 'in general', just as there is no such thing as a finished product 'in general' in manufacturing. They are always concrete. Practical experience shows that a brigade's staff is much more united which can see this, its own common concrete product—plainly visible, recognizable and weighty. If this condition is fulfilled, the collective is rightfully called a brigade, be there 5, 20 or 50 workers. Another criterion is the ability of the members of the brigade to see one another: one looks up for a second, and verifies with satisfaction that everyone is where he belongs—on the job; and no one is shirking his work.

"What's the purpose of such a condition? It is well-known that the members of a brigade, especially at first, have different attitudes toward their duties. But when everyone is in view, it's hard to hide behind someone's back both literally and figuratively, and it's easier to lend them a hand.

"The matter here is hardly a matter of technology alone, for a brigade is not only a production cell, as it is frequently represented, but also a social and psychological cell, with complex interrelationships among its members. Indeed, what is the best way to combine in a single brigade workers with varying working conditions, varying skills, ages and so on? Are the cases really so rare, where they look askance at vocational-technical school graduates in the brigade—(They say that he knows more!), and sometimes it's not easy for an older person either—(They look him over closely: will he be able to keep up the fast pace?).

"Unfortunately, it happens that in such conflicts it is not brigade friendship that wins, but personal rivalry. And it is precisely because of this that the young worker to whom I was referring left his brigade.

Together With the Engineer or by a Secret Deal

"Nor is the problem of the relationship of the brigade and the foreman or the brigade and the ITR /Inzhenerno-tekhnicheskiy rabotnik, engineering and technical personnel/ a simple matter.

Is it proper (is it expedient!) for all engineering and technical personnel and employees to keep individual forms of stimulus and organization of labor, as is done at the present time?

I had to listen to a number of arguments for developing the brigade form of labor organization for specialists. Nor is there a lack of proposals. One of them is, to include the specialists in the brigade. It is already found in rather wide use, although it's not always 'legal': it is well-known that labor legislation forbids paying engineering and technical personnel, and employees, from funds allocated for the workers. And here at today's conference one of the speakers relates that, at a branch conference in Tula it was categorically demonstrated that an engineer does not have to 'take' from the brigade's wages. But if the engineer is a member of the brigade, then it is his wages too; after all, he has first contributed his labor to the achievement of the brigade's results. It is typical that, without prior arrangement, the staff of certain brigades includes foremen, privately handing over part of their extra earnings for receiving their services. Which is preferable, open, official cooperation with a legal contract, or secret agreements, which closely resemble bribes?

"Another direction, is to permit the brigades to temporarily enlist engineers, designers, or sociologists to solve definite problems, as for example suggests P. G. Bunich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. In cases of genuine assistance, the brigade could pay the consultants a fee, which could in practise realize creative ideas and increase their earnings. The competition for the right to become a brigade consultant would promote activisation of the engineer corps. And the conditions of the cooperation could be set by official contract.

"Special requirements are laid on the brigade leader, or at least should be. This is understood in the majority of enterprises, and it is not by chance that today brigades are organized above all in places where they have a potential brigade leader. To be a brigade leader, that is at the same time having the duties and the calling of a leader is no easy matter for a variety of reasons, including psychological reasons. Just yesterday a man was one of the rank and file, and was trying along with the others to 'get around' the foreman, was 'knocking out' profitable operations, was thinking up ways to leave the job a little early, and so on. And today he's chosen as the brigade leader. What sort of brigadier will he make? How can he demand the required discipline from the others, if he himself was just recently trying to invent ways to violate discipline?

A Leader by Appointment or by Calling

"The figure of a brigade leader is becoming a popular one. This means that to rely only upon 'natural' leaders would not be correct. Brigade leaders should be taught; special-purpose training should be organized for them. Moreover, in the interests of developing democracy in production, and to increase the workers' political and labor activity, it would be expedient to take steps to see that all workers could complete a course in brigade administration. There are even today cases where the workers take turns playing the role of brigade leader. But are these not the ideals of today's worker: he can carry out various operations; alternate types of labor; manage in an economical manner; control technological processes; lead people; and maintain contact with the administration; in a word, be a brigade leader.

"The genuine worker in a brigade is a collectivist not only by the functions he performs, but also by his aim in life. His relations with the other members of the brigade become different; his interest in the common results of their combined labor more profound; and his feelings of social justice are more mature.

"It is unacceptable to allocate funds for stimulus, as one for the workers, another for the engineering and technical personnel, just as it is unacceptable to introduce brigades only for workers. It is unacceptable to maintain boundaries, under which there is one cafeteria for the workers, and another for the engineering and technical personnel. Under the new forms of stimulus and organization of labor the organization of public catering is more fitting, such as that in the Riga production association 'VEF', where all categories of workers are served comfortably, quickly and well.

"Yes, there is a great deal of work to be done in the area of social training. The planners require profound psychological, social-psychological and social knowledge; they must reject certain backward and mistaken impressions which are deeply rooted owing to the lengthy predominance of the individual form of stimulus and organization of labor.

A Questionnaire After the Conference

"Following one of the scientific-practical conferences, the participants were given a questionnaire, on which they were asked to respond, why should brigades be established, and which problems could they help solve? First place among the answers were—to increase labor productivity, reduce personnel turnover, and improve educational work. There were many suggestions for improving brigade self-management. Actually, self-supporting brigades are still encountered rarely. Probably, true self-support would consist of the fact that a brigade would be given, along with its production task, the required resources for fulfilling it, and the savings in resources would accrue to the brigade. But one must take note of the fact that today one frequently encounters what one may again call 'unctontrolled disposition' of resources: the brigade leader pays off the storekeeper for a tool; the driver pays off the mechanic for spare parts, and so on. However, such self-support can in no way be considered normal.

"In the questionnaires there were quite a few complaints about the fact that the tasks for increasing labor productivity which are set forth for the labor collectives, do not always stimulate the spread of the collective form of organization. To fulfill them one might be able to get by with the old methods. There are quite a few opinions on the 'human factor' also. Those responding are convinced that the brigade form should bring both moral and material satisfaction. Apparently, the growth of labor productivity in the brigade, as compared with individual organization, should be accompanied by increased earnings. Consequently, the rate-fixer should not unnecessarily or needlessly often employ the 'scissors' and 'cut' the wage rates. The workers should feel the effect which they receive from their association. This principle, unfortunately, is quite often forgotten and is not observed, and above all because the processes which take place in the brigade are not defined for the long term. Plans for social and economic development are

disseminated, at best, to the level of the shop. They are far from the section level, not to mention the brigade, nor moreover to its individual members. This practical experience, however, shows that it is much easier to create brigades and even good ones, than to support their vital activity and continuous long-range development. But it is precisely thus that one must relate to this event, to which the future belongs."

From the Editors. In publishing the remarks of B. Kutyrev (which are somewhat controversial), the editors wished to continue the dialog on the social problems of brigade labor organization. How are they being solved at your enterprise? What are the shortcomings in organizing brigade labor and how can they be overcome?

We await your letters.

9006
CSO: 1828/92

FLAWS IN LABOR MECHANIZATION INDICATOR POINTED OUT

Moscow VESTNIK STATISTIKI in Russian No 1, Jan 83 pp 54-56

[Article by L. Potakhova, chief of the department of statistics of technical progress in the Leningrad Oblast and City Statistical Administration: "The Indicator for Reduction of Manual Labor in Industry"]

[Text] In accordance with the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Improving Planning and Strengthening the Influence of the Economic Mechanism on Increasing Production Efficiency and Work Quality," the five-year plans for the industrial ministries, production associations and industrial enterprises include targets to reduce the use of manual labor, in the form of an indicator for the proportion of workers carrying out manual work with machines and mechanisms and manual work not associated with machines and mechanisms, expressed as the total numbers of workers at the end of each year of the five-year plan. The "Report on the Numbers of Workers Engaged in Manual Labor"--form No 2-t (RT)--has been introduced for evaluation of task fulfillment.

The figures in this report should characterize not only the degree of plan fulfillment but also the changes that have taken place in the level of labor mechanization for workers and correspondingly in the use of manual labor, compared with the previous period.

Experience in processing and analyzing data from report form No 2-t (RT), however, has shown that despite the large capital investments to retool production, for many enterprises and a number of ministries the level of labor mechanization is falling while the proportion of manual labor by workers is growing. In a number of cases enterprises are not meeting plan targets to reduce the proportion of manual labor by workers even though the actual numbers of workers engaged in manual labor does not exceed the planned level.

The fact is that the indicator for labor mechanization, calculated from the number of workers, is suitable for evaluating the actual level of mechanization at a given moment of time but does not accurately reflect the dynamics of production mechanization. Despite the regular successes in the field of mechanization and automation at industrial enterprises in Leningrad city, the ratio of workers engaged in mechanized and manual labor is changing very insignificantly (from 1975 to 1979 the proportion of workers engaged in mechanized labor increased by less than one point).

In order to assess the dynamics of labor mechanization, it has been proposed in the literature to calculate the proportion of mechanized labor for a reporting period or plan period from the norms of the base period*:

$$K_1' = \frac{M_o + (P_o - P_1)}{M_o + (P_o - P_1) + P_o - (P_o - P_1)} \cdot 100 = \frac{T_o - P_1}{T_o} \cdot 100 \quad (1)$$

where K_1' is the proportion of workers engaged in mechanized labor during the reporting period, calculated from the norms for the base period (as a percentage;

T_o is the total number of workers in the base period;

M_o and M_1 are the numbers of workers engaged in mechanized labor in the base and reporting periods;

and P_o and P_1 are the numbers of workers engaged in manual labor in the base and reporting periods.

In this case, labor expenditures are the equivalent of the physical volume of production, and that part of output that in the base period was produced by the mechanized method will be reflected in the reporting period with the same value for labor expenditures (M_o), while that part that is produced for the first time by the mechanized method will be calculated from the norms for manual labor in the base period ($P_o - P_1$).

By comparing the indicator thus calculated for the proportion of workers engaged in mechanized labor with the indicator for the base period it is possible to assess the change in the workers engaged in mechanized labor:

$$I_k = \frac{K_1'}{K_o} \quad (2)$$

Let us clarify this using an example.

Table 1

Indicators Characterizing Labor Mechanization	Base Period	Reporting Period
Numbers of workers	100	80
including:		
mechanized labor	50	35
manual labor	50	45
Coefficient of labor mechanization, %	50.0	43.8
Proportion of manual labor, %	50.0	56.2

* N. Kaminskiy and Ya. Kvasha. "Measuring Normativ Labor Mechanization, Taking Account of Its Productivity." VESTNIK STATISTIKI No 5, 1961, p 46; and G. Edel'gauz. "Determination of the Level of Mechanization in Production Processes in Machine Tool Building." VESTNIK STATISTIKI No 9, 1961, p 42

The coefficient of mechanization in norms for the base period is

$$K_1' = \frac{50 + (50 - 45)}{100} \cdot 100 = 55\%$$

and the index for the coefficient of mechanization equals:

$$I_k = \frac{55}{50} \cdot 100 = 110\%$$

Compared with the previous period in comparable numbers, the proportion of manual labor has been reduced from 50 to 45 percent, which is assessed as positive. However, in terms of the actual numbers, 56.2 percent of all workers are now engaged in manual labor.

This calculation method is acceptable only for individual sections having a constant volume of output or work, where as the result of mechanization measures implemented there is a drop in the numbers of workers engaged both in mechanized and manual labor. For enterprises as a whole or for a region, however, this method should not be used without additional calculations.

In this case it is necessary first to compute the arbitrary numbers of workers needed to fulfill the production program for the reporting period at the base labor productivity by means of multiplying the base number by the rate of growth for output.*

It is also necessary to decide which groups of workers should be included in the number of workers engaged in manual labor. Formula (1) presupposes that all workers are divided into mechanized or manual categories. In accordance with existing statistical classifications, as is known, all workers are divided into five goups according to the degree of mechanization. These are: those doing work 1) observing the operation of automatic equipment; 2) helping machines and mechanisms; 3) carrying out manual work on machines or mechanisms; 4) carrying out manual work not associated with machines or mechansism; and 5) carrying out manual work for repairs and maintenance. The first two groups are mechanized workers and, in accordance with Gosplan and USSR Central Statistical Administration instructions,** workers doing manual labor are assigned to groups 3 and 4, that is, those carrying out manual work for repairs and maintenance are not included among the manual workers. Meanwhile, when mechanization measures are implemented, those workers freed from manual labor can transfer not only to the group of workers engaged in mechanized labor but also to the group of repairmen and maintenance men carrying out manual work; and in individual sections, the increase in the proportion of repair work can be very significant.

---

* For enterprises that have been transferred to planning by normativ net output, that is the indicator to be used.

** "Sovershenstvovaniye khozyaystvennogo mekhanizma. Sbornik dokumentov" [Improving the Economic Mechanism. A Collection of Documents], Second Edition, Moscow, 1982, p 150.

Taking this into account, it can be suggested that the calculation for increase in the indicator for labor mechanization be done using two methods: 1) without counting the group of maintenance workers, for the individual section or for an enterprise where reconstruction or major production mechanization measures are being implemented, which can lead to significant shifts in the structure of workers in terms of the stage of mechanization; and 2) by assigning the groups of workers engaged in repair and maintenance manual work to the category of manual labor, main variant, suitable for all enterprises and regions as a whole. The calculation formula will be:

$$\frac{T_0 \cdot I_{TP} - P_1}{T_o \cdot I_{TP}} \qquad (3)$$

Let us consider the method for calculating the indicator for growth in labor mechanization using as an example one of the plants in Leningrad Oblast at which the volume of commerical output in 1981 increased 3.2 percent compared with 1980 (plan: 3 percent) with a simultaneous reduction in the numbers of workers.

Table 2.

	End of 1980		Plan for 1981		Actual at end of 1981		Arbitrary Numbers at end of 1980
Indicator characterising labor mechanization	men	as % of total	men	as % of total	men	as % of total	
Numbers of workers including:	1594	100.0	1628	100.0	1571	100.0	1645
those engaged in:							
mechanized labor (groups 1 & 2)	632	99.7	X	X	598	38.1	653
manual labor with machines and mechanisms and not with machines and mechanisms (groups 3 & 4)	858	53.8	872	53.6	866	55.1	885
manual labor on repair and maintenance (group 5)	104	6.5	X	X	107	6.8	107

We can see that the enterprise did not meet the target set for the proportion of workers engaged manual labor despite the fact that the actual numbers of workers engaged in manual labor in 1981 were less than the planned number. Compared with 1980, the level of labor mechanization for workers fell, and there was a corresponding increase in the proportion of workers engaged in manual labor. Having calculated the arbitrary numbers of workers (1594 x 1,032), we apply formula (3) in variant 2, since the proportion of repair workers remained almost unchanged:

$$K_1' = \frac{1645 - 973}{1645} \cdot 100 = 40.9\%$$

$$I_k = \frac{40.9}{39.7} \cdot 100 = 103\%$$

During the reporting period the proportion of workers engaged in manual labor (groups 3 and 4) will be:

$$100\% - 40.9\% - 6.8\% = 52.3\%$$

which is lower than the planned target.

Like other indicators for labor mechanization calculated according to labor expenditure, the proposed indicator does not reflect all the changes associated with the replacement of less productive machines with more productive machines, that is, with secondary mechanization; but it can serve for measuring the effectiveness of work done to reduce the use of manual labor.

9642
CSO: 1828/97

UTILIZATION OF AZERBAIJAN MANPOWER EXAMINED

Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 11, Mar 83 p 10

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences Prof F. Faradzhev under the rubric "The Economic Mechanism of Intensification": "If There Are Labor Resources: The Management of Employment in the Republic"]

[Text] One of the pressing problems of the hynamic development of the socialist economy is the problem of the effective and rational utilization of labor resources. The demographic situation, linked with the remote consequences of the war, has created an unfavorable trend in the growth of labor resources, which has fallen sharply in the country as a whole during the eighties. Under these conditions great significance attaches to the fullest utilization of labor resources in the regions which enjoy a favorable balance of able-bodied population.

In the Interests of the Country and the Republic

High growth of labor resources can be noted in the republics of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus. Azerbaijan is one such republic, and its share in the growth of able-bodied population exceeds its proportionate share in the composition of the country's population. The republic's population constitutes 2.5 percent [of the total], while its share in the growth of able-bodied population in the eighties is expected to reach 11-12 percent. These figures give a certain impression of the national economic significance of the best utilization of the growth in labor resources.

The problem's solution is seen in orienting the system of state, plan and economic regulation mainly toward the establishment of labor-intensive production processes in the regions where labor resources are emerging. Statewide interests dictate the need for accelerated development of labor intensive sectors of machine building wherever there are no difficulties with labor force growth. Practical work has shown that sufficiently effective methods are yet to be found for the relocation of large groups of indigenous population from the above-mentioned republics to take up permanent residence in others, and especially in isolated localities.

Of course, the establishment of this fact does not exclude but, on the contrary, presupposes the elaboration of effective measures to create the necessary

organizational, economic, social and--last but not least--sufficiently favorable conditions for the work and life of newcomers attracted from labor-producing regions to districts with, as a rule, more rigorous and unusual conditions.

In order to increase the mobility of indigenous population from labor-saturated regions and mainly in order to secure the planned relocation of labor resources, it is necessary to create at the place of their new work conditions which are no less favorable than those under which the newcomers used to live. Studies have shown that the role played by high labor remuneration as a decisive incentive for the migration of citizens of southern republics to isolated regions of the country is constantly weakening. Coming to the forefront are living conditions, the state of the social infrastructure, the availability of goods and other conditions of work and life.

The party and komsomol organizations and the state organs in Azerbaijan are engaged in systematic work to direct groups of young specialists toward the labor-deficient regions of the country. There is an established practice in the department for migration and organized recruitment of labor [orgnabor] to direct the population in conformity with the plan into construction projects and various enterprises. Thus in 1982 and in conformity with the plan, 100 families migrated to Amur Oblast to work in agriculture. Even more families will be directed this year and in the following years. The republic's labor organs are carefully studying working and living conditions for newcomers in a situation which is very unusual for them. In order to succeed in this in the future it is exceptionally important that the newcomers become firmly established in the new places. The compact joint settling of migrating families could be quite substantially significant, since it would ensure that their new place of work would be more attractive.

Effective organizational forms of the republic's labor participation in the joint development of new regions in the country could be found, for example, in establishing construction units (following the model of the mobile mechanized column of Azerbaijan land reclamation specialists operating in Arkhangelsk Oblast), transport organizations, lumber industry enterprises and other organizations for the procurement and initial processing of timber and other resources so as to satisfy more fully the requirements of the entire national economy and of Azerbaijan.

The increase in the able-bodied population's mobility is linked with the potentialities of the professional and technical training of youth. During the last decade there has been significant growth in the contingent of young people studying in the system of vocational and technical education in the republic. Nevertheless, the existing material base does not meet the requirements for fast growth rates in the training of the skilled work force, with the result that the shift index in vocational and technical schools has risen to 1.98. The ministries and departments which have the appropriate enterprises on the republic's territory must show greater concern for the creation and development of a network of professional and technical schools and for supplying them with modern equipment and technical facilities.

Labor-Intensive Sectors and Their Development

The development of labor-intensive factors, as evidenced by Azerbaijan's experience, produces a large social and economic effect and helps increase employment in such sectors as instrument building, the radio equipment, electrotechnical and many other industries. This process is accompanied by increased social labor productivity, the formation of a large new group of highly skilled workers and scientific and technical cadres, increased earnings and improved labor organization.

The economic necessity to develop labor-intensive and less capital-intensive (in terms of cost per unit work place) processing industries for Azerbaijan is also determined by the fact that for a long time, and under the influence of historical and natural characteristics, its economy has been distinguished by a high share for the extraction sector, including oil extraction, which has to a certain extent held back the dynamic and comprehensive development of production.

Highly dynamic production growth remains a feature of Azerbaijan's economy for the Third 5-Year Plan running, thus in the 10th 5-Year Plan years the Azerbaijan SSR, with the highest growth among the union republics in industrial production (47 percent) and agricultural output (47 percent), achieved at the same time the highest growth in industrial labor productivity (28 percent) and one of the highest increases in agricultural output [as published, presumably meaning agricultural labor productivity] (24 percent). This trend is also characteristic of the 11th 5-Year Plan. The appreciable growth of labor efficiency has been combined with faster growth in the numbers of people employed in the economy.

At the same time, during the 10th and current 5-year plan years there has been the largest absolute natural growth of labor resources in Azerbaijan, as a result of which the social economy cannot, for the time being, cope with employing the entire additional population group reaching working age.

The Role of Agroindustrial Complexes

The republic's orientation on specialized development of labor-intensive southern agricultural crops has, over the last few years, increased the inflow of manpower into the economy's agrarian sector. The existence of sufficient reserves of able-bodied population in rural areas creates quite favourable opportunities for agroindustrial complexes with developed local processing of produce so as to increase food resources and utilize them for the corresponding proportional development of the production and social infrastructure in rural areas and for the successful accomplishment of tasks set by the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum.

A section of the able-bodied population is transferring its labor efforts to the development of individual subsidiary plots. The relevant decisions create good opportunities and material incentives for the development of this sphere of labor application so as to realize the food program.

There is an urgent need to establish efficiently functioning cooperation between the individual farms and the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, consumer cooperatives and procurement organs. It would, of course, be an extreme oversimplification to link the solution of the employment problem with orienting the entire manpower surplus in rural areas toward work on individual subsidiary farms. From the view point of national economic interests, and taking into account the long-term social consequences, the effectiveness and attractiveness of working on these plots will yield appreciably to jobs in major enterprises.

In rural areas, insofar as they are the basic source for the formation and release of manpower, it would be expedient to concentrate on the establishment of smaller enterprises, shops and branches of major plants. As regards the relatively large new industrial enterprises, if their size is dictated by technological necessity they must, obviously, be set up within the framework of territorial production complexes which are being established close to intensive concentrations of labor resources.

The establishment of smaller enterprises with small numbers of workers does not violate the established laws of natural migration of population and demographic development. Also important is the fact that a move by a rural worker to the city transforms him from a producer to a consumer of foodstuffs.

The potential of irrigated agriculture in labor-surplus regions creates highly favorable opportunities for significantly increasing the output of southern agricultural crops. Insofar as the expansion of labor-intensive sectors of light industry in the traditionally established regions for processing the corresponding agricultural raw materials is encountering real difficulties in connection with the manpower shortage, it would be economically expedient to accelerate the creation of new work places in the zone of raw material production in labor-surplus regions so as to put mass consumer goods on the market. This would make it possible to reduce the loss of valuable raw materials and shorten long-distance and some cross-haul transportation.

The measures for fuller utilization of labor resources are being taken under conditions influenced by more rigid lines concerning the limits on personnel numbers, capital investments and resources. Given this situation, it would be in the interests of society as a whole to strengthen the levers of plan influence on the rational proportions of employment in labor-saturated regions. These questions are being examined by the republic's planning organs, but general solutions are also needed.

It would seem expedient to grant the republics broader rights in labor planning for the differentiated determination of the most rational employment structure. Thus, as regards republics which have labor resources at their disposal, it might be possible, in our opinion, not to set separate manpower limits for sectors in the production and nonproduction spheres, since the development of the latter is strongly influenced by regional peculiarities and specific requirements for the development of production. The management apparatus, however, must be limited by central authority.

As regards the limits on working wage funds, it would be expedient to set them for the republican economy as a whole, according to the growth rate for labor resources in the coming period, thus giving the republics a chance to choose their own sector proportions for wage funds.

It could be possible to set manpower limits for enterprises under union and union republic jurisdiction on the territory of such republics bearing in mind the growth in workplace numbers and the need to raise the shift coefficient and allocating the appropriate material resources. In order to increase the plan influence on the labor efficiency indicators it becomes necessary to determine centrally the share of production volume increase resulting from higher labor productivity bearing in mind the existence of labor resources in the republics, with that share possibly being significantly different from the average for the country.

CSO: 1828/96

EDUCATION

INSTITUTE, TRADE SCHOOL ANNOUNCEMENTS IN BUKHARA AREA

Bukhara SOVETSKAYA BUKHARA in Russian 1 Jul 82 p 4

/Announcements: "Where To Go To Study: The UzSSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education Announces Acceptances for the Academic Year 1982--1983 at Higher and Secondary Specialized Educational Institutions--By Fields of Specialization"/

/Excerpts/ Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze

For the Daytime Division

Russian language and literature (along with graduates of schools where Russian is the language of instruction, acceptance is also granted to graduates of rural schools where Uzbek is the language of instruction), Uzbek language and literature, English language, German language, mathematics (with Uzbek and Russian as the languages of instruction), mathematics and physics (with Russian as the language of instruction), physics, biology with the fundamentals of agriculture, history and Soviet law, drawing and sketching (with Uzbek and Russian as the languages of instruction), physical education (with Russian as the language of instruction), elementary military instruction and physical education (with Russian as the language of instruction), music and singing, general technical disciplines and labor, general technical disciplines, labor and physics, pedagogics and methodology of elementary teaching, chemistry and biology.

Those enrolling must pass the following entrance exams:

For the departments: Russian philology, Uzbek philology, and foreign languages, history--native language and literature (written and oral), history of the USSR (oral), foreign language (oral): physics, mathematics, general technical disciplines and labor--mathematics (written and oral), physics (oral), native language and literature (written), natural sciences by specialized field, biology and the fundamentals of agriculture--biology (oral), chemistry (oral), physics (oral), native language and literature (written): chemistry and biology--chemistry (oral), biology (oral), mathematics (oral), native language (written): pedagogics and methods of elementary teaching--native language (written and oral), history of the USSR (oral), mathematics (oral),for the graphic arts department--by field of specialization, native language and literature (written), history of the USSR (oral): in the graphic arts department--drawing and sketching, mathematics (oral), physics (oral), native language and literature (written); for the department of physical

education--by fields of specialization, biology (oral), chemistry (oral), native language and literature (written).

Applications for acceptance here may be submitted through 31 July; entrance exams will be conducted from 1 through 20 August.

Applications are to be submitted to the rector of the institute along with a supplementary document concerning education (original), references for enrollment at a VUZ, a medical statement (Form No 286), 4 photo-cards (3×4), extracts from the labor book (for workers).

Those enrolling at the institute will personally present their passports, military cards, or registered certificate.

For application forms, write to the following address: city of Bukhara, Kommunary Street, 2, Telephone 4-37-57.

Admissions Commission

Bukhara Gas Industry Tekhnikum imeni A. K. Kortunov

Full-Time Division

Drilling oil and gas wells, operation of oil and gas wells, operation of automatic and remote-control facilities, turbine construction, internal-combustion engines.

Correspondence Division

By fields of specialization: Drilling oil and gas wells, internal-combustion engines.

For those accepted at the tekhnikum on the basis of complete secondary school for the full-time division the term of instruction is 2 years, 6 months; for the correspondence division it is 2 years, 7 months. For those accepted on the basis of incomplete secondary school for the full-time division the term is 3 years, 6 months.

The tekhnikum accepts persons up to 30 years of age with a secondary or incomplete secondary education for the Second and First Courses respectively.

There is no age limitation for those entering the correspondence division.

Those entering the tekhnikum must pass exams in the following disciplines: on the basis of complete secondary school: mathematics (oral), Russian language and literature (composition); on the basis of incomplete secondary school: mathematics (oral), Russian language (dictation).

Those entering must present the following--an application to the director with a supplementary document concerning education (original), a medical statement (Form No 286), four photo-cards 3×4 cm in size (without headgear), and a copy of their labor book (for those having at least two years of work experience).

Documents are being accepted for those entering on the basis of incomplete secondary school--up to 31 July, on the basis of secondary school--up to 14 August, and to the correspondence division--up to 10 August.

Entrance exams will run from 1 through 21 August.

Those enrolling at the tekhnikum are provided with dormitory accomodations and are generally given a stipend amounting to 30--37 rubles.

The tekhnikum's address is as follows: City of Bukhara, 103 Kirov Street, Bus Routes 6, 7, 14, Gulistan or Medical School Stops. Telephone: 3-71-54.

Tekhnikum Board of Directors

Bukhara Construction Tekhnikum imeni G. Dimitrov

Daytime Division

Industrial and civil construction, erection of metal and reinforced-concrete structural components, sanitary-engineering facilities for buildings, architecture of rural populated places, agricultural and civil construction.

Correspondence Division

By fields of specialization: industrial and civil construction, sanitary-engineering facilities for buildings.

Evening Division

By fields of specialization: industrial and civil construction.

The tekhnikum accepts persons up to 30 years of age with a secondary or an incomplete secondary education for the Second or the First Course.

Those enrolling at the tekhnikum must pass the following exams: on the basis of complete secondary school: mathematics (oral), Russian language and literature (composition), drawing for those enrolling in the specialized field of "Architecture of Rural Populated Places"; on the basis of incomplete secondary school: mathematics (oral), Russian language (dictation).

Note: Persons who have graduated from national schools, instead of the exam in Russian language and literature, must pass an exam in their own native language and literature.

There is no age limitation on those enrolling in the correspondence division.

Those entering the tekhnikum will be provided with dormitory space.

For acceptance at the tekhnikum it is necessary to present the following items: an application to the director, a document concerning education (original), a medical statement (Form No. 286), four photo-cards (3×4), and a copy of the labor book (for those having work experience of at least two years).

Term of instruction: for those accepted on the basis of complete secondary school for the full-time division--2 years, 8 months, for the correspondence division--2 years, 7 months, and for the evening division--3 years, 3 months.

For those accepted on the basis of incomplete secondary school for the full-time division--3 years, 6 months.

At present documents are being accepted for those enrolling in the tekhnikum:

for those entering on the basis of 7--8 grades, through 31 July, on the basis of 10--11 grades, through 14 August. For the evening division documents are being accepted from 15 July through 15 November, and for the correspondence division, through 10 August.

Persons from out of town are provided with dormitory space.

Our address is as follows: City of Bukhara, 26 Promyshlennaya Street, Bus Routes 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, Stroitel'nyy Tekhnikum Stop. Telephone: 3-03-16.

Tekhnikum Board of Directors

Bukhara Industrial-Pedagogical Tekhnikum

Daytime Division

Mechanization of agriculture, technology of welding production.

The tekhnikum accepts persons up to 30 years of age, having a complete secondary education, a corresponding specialty as a tractor-operator, third class, a fitter for repairing tractors, motor vehicles, and farm machinery, third class, tractor-field-work brigade leaders, master repair-men for the engineering maintenance of machine-tractor pools, and electric-gas welders from among the following: persons demobilized from the Soviet Army, those who have graduated from rural vocational-technical schools with production-line work experience of at least one year; persons who have graduated with distinction from rural vocational-technical schools are accepted without production-line work experience; workers and kolkhoz members who have work experience in agricultural mechanization of at least two years.

The term of instruction is 2 years, 10 months.

Entrance exams will be conducted from 1 through 20 August in the following disciplines:

Russian or Uzbek literature (composition), mathematics (oral), passing a skills test in one's field of specialization.

Those accepted by the tekhnikum's full-time division receive stipends and are provided with free meals (three a day), summer and winter prescribed equipment, working equipment, work clothes, regular and work shoes, as well as dormitory space.

Those entering must present their applications to the director with a supplementary document concerning education (original), a school graduation certificate, indicating what courses have been taken, copies of the labor book (for workers), a medical statement (Form No. 286), and photo-cards (3×4).

Passports and military cards are to be presented in person.

The tekhnikum's address is as follows: Bukhara, 705000, Ibn Sina Street, No. 9, Bukhara Industrial-Pedagogical Tekhnikum. Bus routes 1, 10, Stops "Silk-Winding Factory No. 4--"Excavator." Telephone: 3-23-34 3-33-07.

Tekhnikum Board of Directors

Bukhara Light Industry Tekhnikum

Daytime and Evening Divisions

Fabric finishing, cotton spinning, weaving.

Persons are being accepted with secondary-school and eight-year educations.

Those enrolling must pass the following entrance exams:

For the specialized fields of "Cotton Spinning" and "Weaving"--mathematics (oral), native language and literature (written); for the specialized field of "Fabric finishing"--chemistry (oral), native language and literature (written).

The term of instruction in the daytime division, on the basis of secondary school, is 2 years, 6 months, on the basis of eight-year school--3 years, 6 months, while in the evening division it is 3 years, 3 months.

Applications are submitted to the tekhnikum director with a supplementary document concerning education (original), a health certificate (Form No. 286), four photo-cards (3×4), recommendations, and a copy of the labor book (for workers).

Youths are to have with them their military card or registered certificate.

Documents for enrollment in the daytime division are being accepted until 14 August, in the evening division--until 15 November.

Persons from out of town are provided with dormitory space.

Enrollees are generally granted stipends.

Those graduating from the tekhnikum acquire the specialized title of "technician-technologist."

Write to the following address: City of Bukhara, Pablo Neruda Street, Bus Routes 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 14, Taxi Routes 1, 2, 3, with the last stop being "Textile Combine."

Tekhnikum Board of Directors

Bukhara Technical School No. 212

This school provides training for the following occupations:

Electric welders, joiner-carpenters, plasterer-painters, stone-masons, facing-tile-layers, riggers, concrete workers, overhead-crane-operators, reinforcement workers, electricians (the term of instruction for these fields of specialization is 1 year, 6 months).

This school accepts youths and girls who have completed the 10th grade. No entrance exams are required for acceptance at the school. Instruction is conducted in Uzbek and in Russian. During the process of their studies all pupils are paid a stipend amounting to 76 rubles a month. Moreover, they are paid an additional 50 percent of the total amount earned by them in educational-production practice work. The time spent in studying is counted toward their work service period. Persons from out of town are provided with dormitory space.

Graduates will work on construction projects of the Bukharagradostroy Trust. Those who desire will be sent to work at the Glavul'yanovskstroy Trust.

Persons who graduate from the school enjoy the privileges of enrolling at higher and secondary technical educational institutions.

Applications are accepted on a continuing basis.

Classes begin when study groups are filled out.

Those enrolling must submit their applications to the director with a supplementary certificate (original), recommendations from school, passport, 6 photo-cards (3×4), and a medical statement (Form No. 286).

Our address is as follows: City of Bukhara, 9/7 P. Neruda Street, Bus routes 2, 8, 10, 11, 14, Taxi routes 1, 2, 3, Telephone: 4-63-01, 6-60-60.

School Board of Directors

Bukhara Municipal Vocational-Technical School No. 73 imeni 60th Anniversary of the Komsomol

Painters for outdoor-decorative work, operators for oil and gas extraction, electric-gas welders, electrician-remote-control-mechanics, fitters for transport repair and servicing, carpenter-joiners, fitters for repairing automatic monitoring and measuring instruments, plasterers for decorative-artistic work (the term of instruction for these fields of specialization is 3 years).

The school accepts without entrance exams youths and girls who have completed the 8th grade and who are 15 years of age or older.

After graduating from the school with a three-year course of instruction, the students receive a diploma attesting to their secondary education and acquisition of skills with the right to enroll at higher or secondary educational institutions.

Those who graduate from the school with distinction have the right to enroll at VUZ's without serving a period of mandatory work, and they are accepted outside of the competitive system.

Instruction in the school is conducted in Uzbek and in Russian, the students are provided with free meals and equipment, they are paid 33 percent of the money earned in practice work, persons from out of town are assigned dormitory space, and time spent in studies is counted toward the uninterrupted labor service period.

Those enrolling must submit an application to the director along with a supplementary vita, birth certificate or passport, diploma or certificate of education, medical statement (Form No. 286), 6 photo-cards (3×4), and references from the place of residence.

Classes begin on 1 September.

Our address is as follows: City of Bukhara, 7 Promyshlennaya Street, Bus routes 2, 10 with a stop at GSPTU-73, and 1, 8 with a stop at the Construction Tekhnikum, Telephone Numbers 3-67-76, 3-73-28, and 3-66-58.

School Board of Directors

Zarafshan Secondary Municipal Vocational-Technical School No. 89

On the Basis of the 8th Grade

(With a 3-year term of instruction)

Operator-hydrometallurgist (youths); chemical-production operator (girls); driller for mechanical, rotary-type well drilling (with the right to drive heavy-duty trucks); truck-mounted crane operator (with the right to drive heavy-duty trucks); fitter for repairing motor vehicles (with the right to drive trucks); electric-gas welder; electrician; lathe operator; fitter for KIPiA /monitoring-measuring instruments and automation/ (youths); drifter, painter.

On the Basis of the 10th Grade

(With a 1-year term of instruction)

Operator-hydrometallurgist (youths); driller for mechanical, rotary-type well drilling (with the right to drive a truck); electric welder; electrician; truck-mounted crane operator (with the right to drive a motor vehicle); drifter (term of instruction, 6 months).

The school accepts youths and girls up to 25 years of age with an 8th-grade education in groups with a term of instruction of 3 years, and those with a 10th-grade education in groups with a term of instruction of 1 and 1.5 years.

Persons who have enrolled for instruction in groups on the 8th-grade basis upon graduating from the school receive diplomas with the acquisition of skills and a complete secondary education.

Those who have enrolled for instruction in groups with a term of instruction lasting from 1 to 1.5 years, upon graduating from the school, are given a certificate with the acquisition of the appropriate skills, and they are paid a stipend amounting to 76 rubles per month during the period of instruction, while drifters are paid 120 rubles.

Students enrolled in the school in groups with an 8th-grade education are fully provided for by the state, i. e., they are supplied with free meals three times a day as well as the prescribed equipment.

During the period when they are undergoing production practical work all students are paid 33 percent of the total amount earned while engaged in production.

Those who have graduated from the school with distinction enjoy the privileges of enrolling at secondary special and higher educational institutions.

When enrolling in the school, the following documents are necessary:

An application to the director (with parents' signature); a certificate of secondary education or of completing the 8th grade; passport or birth certificate; recommendations from school; a military card (for those subject to military service obligations); 6-part photos (3×4 and 6×9); a statement from the place of residence; a statement from the parents' place of employment; medical information (Form No. 286).

Classes begin on 1 September.

Documents are now being accepted.

School Board of Directors

2384
CSO: 1828/81

EDUCATION

SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR 1983 DISCUSSED AT MEETING

Moscow UCHITEL'SKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Jan 83 p 1

/Report under the rubric "In the USSR Ministry of Education": "The Frontiers of Public Education in the Third Year of the Five-Year Plan"/

/Text/ The regular meeting was held at the Council on Questions of Secondary General Educational Schools.

Discussed at the meeting were the questions: "On Fulfilling the Plan for the Development of Public Education in 1982, and the Tasks for 1983 in the Light of the Decisions of the November (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee" (report delivered by USSR Minister of Education, M.A. Prokof'yev); and "On the Status, and Measures for Further Improving the Work, of Extra-scholastic Institutions" (report delivered by USSR Deputy Minister of Education, V.M. Korotov).

Taking part in the meeting were: Ye.M. Kozhevnikov, head of the school section of the Science and Educational Institutions Department, CPSU Central Committee; T.P. Yanushkovskaya, chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Union for Workers in Education, Higher Education and Scientific Institutions; M.I. Kondakov, president, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, USSR; and L.I. Shvetskova, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee. Also taking part were union republic ministers of education, and officials from the staff of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR State Planning Committee, ministries and departments; and, representatives of the press.

In his report, USSR Minister of Education M.A. Prokof'yev dwelt on the tasks of the educational system which result from the decisions of the November (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the documents and materials of the ceremonial meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and RSFSR dedicated to the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR; from the report of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov "The USSR is Sixty Years Old", and from his speech at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The most important task of the party and the government is to provide a complete secondary education to the rising generation. On the whole it is being carried out; however, in certain republics a certain number of students are

not completing the eight-year school on time. The number of students leaving school remains high, and the reasons for this phenomenon are not being analyzed sufficiently in the republics.

The proportion of students enrolling in SPTU's /Rural Vocational-Technical Institutions/ is increasing year after year. In the Latvian and Lithuanian SSR's about 30 per cent of those who graduate from the eight-year school go to them, and in the Tajik and Turkmen union republics a little over ten per cent. Together with the organs of vocational-technical education, we must intensify the efforts to prepare the young people for study at vocational-technical institutions.

Work on the programs has been completed, and the concepts of the new programs will find expression in academic and methodical literature as the complete editions of the appropriate textbooks are published. The tasks consist of realizing to the maximum the concepts which lie in the programs, and bringing them to the attention of all the teachers.

Rational organization of labor and training the people for work activities are considered critical problems. The educational system, in cooperation with the enterprises and organizations, have accomplished quite a number of useful things in this regard.

However, many questions remain unresolved. In 1982, 65 per cent of the graduates of an intensive work-training course passed the qualifying examination. But only about one in four graduates went on to work or to study in accordance with the type of work training he had received; in the Georgian and Armenian SSR's it was one in 15. The types of work training are not being coordinated with the needs of the national economy in the proper manner. Changes must be made. This work cannot be done well without the active participation of the production organizations. It must be planned and persistently fulfilled in every rayon.

Increasing the quality of work training is inconceivable without a stronger orientation toward establishing permanent student labor associations. Work training must be based on a well-conceived permanent brigade, composed of students in the 8th through the 10th classes, with careful planning given to tye type of training. It is necessary to strive for such an organization of affairs, and to seek out optimal means for achieving it. The principle that the basis of work training is a permanent student brigade must be implemented in an optimal manner.

The problem of the Russian language is very important. There have been definite achievements in a number of republics. But it is now a question of quality, of complete mastery of the language. The first requirement for this is good teachers. Conducting entrance examinations for teacher-training institutions in the Russian language will become a regular feature, along with increasing the quality and improving the knowledge of the language in the institution itself. Along with improving the process of language training in school, where necessary the time for study must be increased as well. It is worthwhile considering the spread of the practice of establishing schools

with instruction in both the native and the Russian language. Work experience has proven worthwhile in special boarding schools in Azerbaijan and in Georgia, where a proper selection of young people was made for intensive training in the Russian language. The task is not being solved everywhere in the same manner; but the goal is absolutely clear—to assure that the young students attain complete mastery of the Russian language.

The development of physical education and sports among the school children is taking on great significance. In a number of republics a definite amount of work has been accomplished, in accordance with the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers. In the schools of the Ukrainian SSR, 92 per cent of those who have completed the eight-year school and 94 per cent of those who have completed the ten-year school, have been awarded GTO /Ready for Labor and Defense/ badges. Classes in gymnastics, which are held prior to lessons, and daily group physical-training classes for an extended school-day, have been introduced in the overwhelming majority of the schools. Conditions are approximately the same in the schools of the Uzbek SSR, the Lithuanian SSR and the Latvian SSR. In a number of other union republics the indicators are lower. There is a critical need to check the state of affairs and to establish strict order.

At the present time the quota for primary classes is growing, and extended-day groups and schools, as well as preschool establishments, are being developed. Especially careful work with the staff is required in these situations. The first condition is to deal intelligently with the young specialists, the graduates of pedagogical institutions. In a number of republics the gap between the plan and the actual conditions is too wide. Measures must be conceived for decisively improving the situation, and for moving more boldly toward non-competitive special-purpose student admission, which will permit combining in a single element the school, the rayon and the pedagogical institution. And there is an effective remedy to eliminate personnel turnover —getting all the organs to pay greater attention to the work of the teachers, and reacting more sharply to every case of careless attitudes to their needs.

In spreading advanced knowledge, and in practical realization of the concepts laid down in the programs which have been examined in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the institutions have an exceptionally important role, in improving the teachers and the corresponding departments at the pedagogical institutions. Quite a few shortcomings in their work must be overcome. By way of example, in the number of instances that training was not oriented toward the urgent needs of the school.

The CPSU Central Committee has passed a special decree about working with letters and complaints from the workers. However, one still finds quite a few instances of superficial, careless consideration of the complaints with respect to the petitions stated in them.

A great deal of attention is being devoted to the development of public pre-school education. In accordance with the plans of the 11th Five-Year Plan, the number of children involved in these establishments is being increased by approximately three million. A great deal of work is going on for strengthening and developing the material and technical base of the pre-school

institutions, for training the staff, and for improving sanitation and hygiene. However, there are also significant shortcomings. Pre-school institutions tend to lag behind the indicators of the five-year plan in terms of drawing in the children. The principal reason for the unsatisfactory plan fulfillment is the lag in bringing new pre-school establishments into operation. Besides the Belorussian, Uzbek, Georgian and Estonian union republics, introduction of pre-school establishments is not being supported and capital investment ceilings are not being assimilated. The ministries have not been sufficiently persistent in posing to the republic administrative organs the problems of building the pre-school establishments. There are serious complaints about their mode of operation. Here the fundamental rule is that the pre-school establishments operate according to the procedure and the schedule which is suitable for the population.

Also discussed in the report were questions of the construction of educational units, and strengthening the schools' material and technical base.

V.M. Korotov, USSR deputy minister of education, stressed the problems of work specifications for the extra-scholastic institutions. They operate as an integral part of the entire system of public education, and have accrued unique experiences in educational work. In recent years, the observed trend has been increasingly the drawing together of the extra-scholastic institutions and the schools. One of the tasks is to transform the extra-scholastic institutions into organizational-methodical centers for the spread of extra-curricular educational work.

Today, massive development of the extended day is an important program. Its rational organization requires enlisting the extra-scholastic institutions in the cause. Their system has grown and prospered: all the basic types of extra-scholastic institutions are quite widely represented in practically every territory. This makes careful interaction and coordinated operation in a single system an especially urgent problem.

Completing the transition to universal mandatory secondary education; massive development of the extended day, and the acute necessity for improving educational work; further development of the system of extra-scholastic institutions, and broadly enlisting the services of production organizations and the public in the business of educating the children: these are in aggregate the new operating conditions, which require posing anew the problems of their operation in the present day.

In conclusion, V.M. Korotov stressed the need for improving the management of extra-scholastic institutions, and for paying more attention to their experience. Each extra-scholastic institution should be assigned a sufficiently-strong enterprise or institution as its mentor, according to its type of activity.

Taking part in the discussion of the reports were RSFSR Minister of Education, G.P. Veselov; Chief of the Main Administration for Educational Institutions Ministry of Railways, G.A. Minin; Azerbaijan SSR Minister of Education, E.M. Kafarova; V. G. Arsenov, an official of the USSR State Planning Committee;

Belorussian SSR First Deputy Minister of Education, R.I. Sernov; Secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, L.I. Shvetskova; Ukrainian SSR First Deputy Minister of Education, V.E. Taranenko; T.P. Yanushkovskaya, chairman of the Central Committee of the Trade Union for Workers in Education, Higher Education and Scientific Institutions; Uzbek SSR Minister of Education, S.Sh. Shermukhamedov; Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, P.D. Selivanov; and Moldavian SSR Minister of Education D.G. Zidu.

Also speaking at the meeting was E.M. Kozhevnikov, head of the school section of the Science and Educational Institutions Department, CPSU Central Committee.

The council made the appropriate decisions on the questions which were discussed.

9006
CSO: 1828/91

EDUCATION

SHORTFALLS IN SECONDARY EDUCATION SYSTEM POINTED OUT

Moscow UCHITEL'SKAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Feb 83 p 2

[Article by V. Arsenov, chief of the subdivision for education of the USSR Gosplan, candidate of pedagogical sciences: "The Five-Year Plan Produces Report"1

[Text] The article by the secretary of the Pskov CPSU Obkom, L. Ul'yanov (UCHITEL'SKAYA GAZETA of 28 December 1982) discusses a very important problem--the link between economics and pedagogy. This link is becoming truly unbreakable under the Eleventh Five-Year Plan as, perhaps, never before.

The main feature of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan is accelerated rates of economic development. This task was set by the 26th CPSU Congress, emphasizing that in the 1980's the Communist Party will consistently continue its economic strategy, whose ultimate goal is a steady rise in the material and cultural level of the life of the people and the creation of conditions for all-around development of the individual.

The increased rates of economic development of the most important branches of material production and the decisive changeover to the utilization of intensive factors in economic growth essentially changed the ratio between the increase in national income and capital investments. Under the Eleventh Five-Year Plan for the first time the growth of national income will exceed the volume of capital investments. This will be achieved as a result of complete and efficient utilization of the already existing scientific and production potential, and increased effectiveness of capital investments which will be used mainly for technical re-equipment and reconstruction of production. And the main basis for growth of the national income will be increased labor productivity. In industry the proportion of products obtained as a result of this will amount to more than 90 percent, and in agriculture--all of the increase in output.

A typical feature of the current five-year plan is the fact that the country has entered a period of stabilization of labor resources. They will increase only in the republics of Central Asia. And in individual regions of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine and Belorussia even a negative balance of personnel is expected.

Under these conditions the national economy desperately needs personnel with secondary education, workers who have polytechnical knowledge and are prepared for labor in a modern plant and in modern agricultural production. The more difficult assignments for increasing labor productivity are related in the closest way to further improvement and development of mandatory universal secondary education of youths and their preparation for labor. This is the most important order of the economy for the school and the main result of the educational activity of pedagogical collectives and public education agencies.

But during this school year in the country as a whole the number of graduates of the 8th grade who are continuing education in secondary educational institutions has dropped somewhat. In particular, for several years now plans for staffing secondary vocational and technical schools have not been fulfilled. And this is a serious shortcoming both of the schools and of the public education agencies. For the secondary vocational and technical schools today are the main source of skilled personnel both for the city and for the country. And to instill in 8th-grade graduates the desire to go on to vocational and technical schools is one of the tasks of occupational orientation. And we still see serious shortcomings here. For example, students are very unwilling to go on to vocational and technical schools that lead to construction occupations. And the country needs them very much.

Evening and correspondence schools for working youths occupy a special place in public education. There are now 4.4 million people studying in them. Each year more than 1.2 million young workers and kolkhoz workers receive a secondary education without leave from production. Our task is to improve the level of training and education in evening schools. But certain public education agencies are neglecting the leadership of them and allowing serious shortcomings in the content of the training and educational work. Up to this point the dropout rate of students is still high and the attendance rate is low. The demands and responsibility for educating the adult population are decreasing, especially for those over 30 years of age. And this undoubtedly cannot but be reflected in the country's economic and social development.

The five-year plan envisions a certain reduction in the admissions of 8th-grade graduates of day schools to evening and correspondence schools for working youths. The present level of admission into 9th grades of general educational schools and into secondary specialized training institutions will be maintained. The plan for admissions into secondary vocational and technical schools is to be increased. While in 1981 every fifth 8th-grade graduate entered a secondary vocational and technical school, in 1985 every fourth one will. In this connection questions of vocational orientation become especially crucial both in the school and in the vocational and technical school itself.

Public education agencies and pedagogical collectives of schools, under the leadership of party committees and ispolkoms of local soviets, are doing a considerable amount of work to improve the conditions for labor training. Industrial enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes are rendering an immense amount of assistance to educators in this. Last year alone 218 training-production

combines were opened, 1,459 laboratories for service personnel were equipped in secondary schools, as were 5,617 laboratories for vocational education and 356 laboratories for mechanization of agriculture. In 2,476 training and production combines labor education is being provided for about 2 million school children--almost 40 percent of the senior classmen.

An immense amount of experience in labor training and education has been accumulated, for example, in the Belorussian SSR. More than 80 percent of the senior classmen study in 230 training-production combines of the republic. They have established close interrelations among schools, vocational and technical schools, industrial and agricultural enterprises and construction organizations. As a result of the purposive occupational orientation of youths, the branches of the national economy are better supplied with skilled personnel in the Belorussian SSR than in other republics.

Commissions for public education and culture of the Soviet Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet in April of last year at a joint meeting considered questions of further improvement of labor training, education and occupational orientation of school children. It was noted that in recent years a well-thought-out system has been arranged, new training plans and programs have been introduced, and the qualitative makeup of labor teachers is improving. This is gratifying. But this is not a time to become complacent. It is necessary to improve the content of labor education in a very serious way. In many schools labor lessons have still not become lessons of moral education of the individual, the formation of such qualities as thriftiness, a sense of ownership, the ability to overcome difficulties and civil responsibility for the selection of a life path. This is perhaps why so far only 23 percent of the senior classmen who have been qualified study or work in the profile of labor education that has been acquired in the general educational schools. In the Belorussian, Moldavian, Ukrainian and Estonian SSR's this figure is 27-29 percent, in the Georgian SSR--only 7 percent and in the Armenian SSR even less--5.6 percent.

The quality of the work of the school is also shown by the following facts: during the past school year about 65.4 percent of the schoolchildren took qualifying examinations at base enterprises. Only 11.6 percent of them are working in the national economy.

All this cannot but disturb us. On the one hand, by the fact that we are still allowing serious shortcomings in labor training, education and occupational orientation of youths. On the other hand, by the fact that millions of rubles invested in labor training are being used ineffectively and are not producing the real return which the state expects. Maintaining shops of base enterprises in training and production combines, equipping training laboratories and shops in schools--all this requires immense expenditures. And while previously, when organizing labor training and education, the public education agencies proceeded only from pedagogical tasks (and this was correct), now the time has come to learn to account for expenditures for these purposes and to consider the problem from the economic standpoint as well.

The school is not the only chance in public education for augmenting labor resources under the five-year plan. There is another one--women and working mothers. To create the necessary conditions for their participation in labor means primarily to provide preschool education for children. There are now 15.5 million young people in kindergartens. By the end of the Twelfth Five-Year Plan it is intended to basically satisfy the needs of the urban and rural population for preschool institutions.

And the economy is already in debt to education and pedagogy. Improvement of compulsory universal secondary education, labor training and occupational orientation and the development of public preschool education are closely related to such problems as the creation and equipment of laboratories, shops and training and production combines as well as the construction of general educational schools and preschool institutions. And yet almost half of the secondary schools in rural areas do not have occupational orientation offices. Even in cities these offices exist in only 13.6 percent of the schools in Georgia, 21.5 percent in Estonia and 28.7 percent in Armenia. Many base enterprises, especially sovkhozes and kolkhozes still are not satisfactorily fulfilling the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers (of 18 August 1978), "On Measures for Further Strengthening the Material and Technical Base of General Educational Schools for Improving Labor Training of Students." And after all the base enterprises have been instructed not only to create training shops and sections, to equip shops, laboratories and rooms for labor, but also to provide them with the necessary materials and render assistance to general educational schools in preparing for the next school year.

In 1982 the plan for the startup of general educational schools and children's preschool institutions was not fulfilled in all union republics. The construction of educational institutions on the whole has improved appreciably, but not in the Kazakh, Azerbaijan, Tajik or Turkmen SSR's.

During the two years of the current five-year plan the Kazakh SSR has failed to assimilate capital investments amounting to more than those for the entire Tenth Five-Year Plan. Last year Kazakhstan was worse than all the other union republics in fulfilling the plan for the startup of preschool institutions. For 7 years now Azerbaijan has not fulfilled the plan for the construction of kindergartens and day nurseries and only twice (in 1977 and 1981) has it fulfilled the plan for the construction of schools. During these years the republic failed to assimilate almost one-fourth of the capital investments allotted for educational institutions. The Tajik and Turkmen SSR's are significantly in arrears.

The main reason for this is the irresponsible attitude of managers of many social organizations toward educational facilities. They occupy less than 1 percent of the volume of construction work and therefore are considered "secondary." And public education agencies are not exercising regular construction and are not searching for possibilities of radically changing the situation.

But there is a possibility. The practice of joint work of the Gosplan and the Ministry of Education of the USSR for comprehensive planning of the republic's economic and social development deserves attention and widespread

dissemination. Each year the ispolkoms of local soviets of people's deputies approve schedules for work on each educational facility and exercise regular control over its fulfillment. All ministries and departments of the republic participate actively not only in the fulfillment of the plan for the startup of educational institutions, but also in the creation of the necessary conditions for their operation.

The problem of improving the joint work of public education and vocational and technical educational agencies requires a radical solution. This will make it possible to develop and to implement comprehensive plans for staffing all training institutions which provide a secondary education and will provide for a uniformly high level of secondary education in schools and secondary vocational and technical schools. Under the conditions of further development of universal secondary education, the school, along with vocational and technical schools, must participate quite directly in the training of personnel. Such is the economy's present requirement on pedagogy. Such is the demand of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan.

11772
CSO: 1828/90

DEMOGRAPHY

DEMOGRAPHIC POLICY CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTED

Moscow VESTNIK STATISTIKI in Russian No 3, Mar 83 pp 65-68

[Report by "A.G. and T.G.": "Problems of Demographic Policy in Socialist Society (An All-Union Scientific Conference)"]

[Text] An all-union scientific conference "Problems of Demographic Policy in Socialist Society" took place in late 1982 in Kiev city. It was organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Council "Socioeconomic Problems of Population," the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research, the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov Center for the Study of Population Problems, the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and Ukrainian SSR State Committee for Labor Scientific Council "Socioeconomic Problems of Population and Labor," and the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics.

Economists and statisticians, workers from planning and statistical organs, and representatives of the Ukrainian party organs and many scientific establishments engaged in questions of demography and labor resources, participated in the conference. Scientists from Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia participated in the work of the conference.

The conference was opened by academician of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Scientists and of VASKhNIL, vice president of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and director of the Ukrainain SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics I. Lukinov, who presented a report titled "Strategic Directions in Improving Demographic Policy in Socialist Society."

At the present stage in the building of communism, demographic policy covers a broad spectrum of problems in population reproduction and forming the socially necessary dimensions and structure for the labor potential, and its effective functioning, he said. The range of this policy includes all the stages of the reproductive cycle and optimizing their relationships according to the criterion of the most prolonged period of active, creative activity and human average life expectancy. Since it is an integral part of the general socioeconomic strategy of the CPSU and Soviet government, our demographic policy maintains the most humane and loftiest goals with respect to the individual and to mankind, and the means for achieving these goals. The essence of these goals is to insure the reproduction and formation of the

new man and the comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual and of society. These goals are realized primarily with the aid of socioeconomic factors and the entire aggregate of their actual functions, including economic conditions, and prerequisites and effective methods for the labor, intellectual, physical and moral and ethical education of the generations. Neither must the obvious fact be ignored that the bellicose forces of imperialism and their ideologues are trying to influence demographic processes along an avenue that is alien to the true interests of the peoples. The enemies of peace make use of any kind of racial and national prejudices in order to kindle internation (mezhnatsional'nyy] hatred and enmity and local and global armed conflicts. The resolution of demographic problems on the truly scientific principles of humane ideas and the concepts of internationalism and the friendship and brotherhood of all peoples presupposes a socioeconomic equalization in their living conditions and creative activity. Socialist society is not indifferent to the degree to which population growth is structured in both relative rates and absolute indexes, or to the national and regional aspects within the country and against the background of world demographic shifts.

Along with the development of theory, the speaker stressed, this requires deep studies of actual demographic processes and models of them, with the development of a system of measures in order to make specific decisions; and this remains the "bottleneck" in the activity of demographers.

It is not enough sometimes to correctly interpret the question of economic development as an external constraint on optimization of population growth, without considering that this is not an external but a most important internal condition for expanded population reproduction. Formation of the individual takes place primarily within social production. For the developing society it is necessary to insure also the appropriate rates for population reproduction. This applies both to the country as a whole and to each of its integral elements, that is, to each nation and nationality. In the analysis of birth rates and mortality rates and the development of programs to activate the generative activity of the population it is extraordinarily important to make a comrehensive approach and comprehensively consider the complex aggregate of existing factors. Only on the basis of basic research on the problem of population reproduction is it possible really to identify the "main element" that triggers change in the entire chain of the reproductive behavior of the family. The material and spiritual conditions of a family's life and the satisfaction of its multifaceted requirements are inherent in the level of development and efficiency of social production.

The problems of demographic policy cover the aggregate of many social factors involved in the regulation of many human relationships within the processes of labor and everyday life. Demographic policy also includes the problem of regulating migration processes.

In conclusion, the speaker said that the broad program to revitalize the demographic situation as outlined by the 26th CPSU Congress and now being successfully implemented, is raising new and crucial problems for demography that must be resolved in the coming years.

The main problems of demographic policy at the present stage were dealt with in the report of corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Studies T. Ryabushkin entitled "The Demographic Situation in the USSR and the Tasks of Demographic Policy in Light of the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress."

The exacerbation of the demographic situation in our country was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress and the task was set of developing an effective demographic policy, he said. The 26th CPSU Congress raised the questions of its practical foreshortening, defining the basic directions of such a policy whose scientific aspects are set forth in the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures to Strengthen State Aid for Families with Children." The speaker went on to say that the present stage in population development in our country is characterized by a transition to the intensive type of reproduction with its inherently low mortality rates and relatively low birth rate. This process is taking place as the result of objective patterns stemming from the entire course of society's social and economic development. At the same time reserves still exist for the further contraction both of total mortality and of infant mortality. With regard to birth rate, in the union republics in the European part of the country its level is dropping with a trend toward stabilization, while in the union republics of Central Asia the process of a dropping birth rate is only just starting. If it creates a threat to normal population reproduction the drop in birth rate cannot be perceived as a positive phenomenon. Optimum conditions are essential for population reproduction, and this must be insured in all the country's economic regions.

Demographic policy is an integral part of the program for social development and improving the living standards of the people. It includes measures to strengthen the family and also the extensive propagandization of demographic knowledge. In a socialist society demographic policy is derived from the principles of humanism and democracy. One integral part of it is a system of measures that insure a given population reproduction accompanied by improvement in living standards, improvements in public health, higher educational and cultural levels and so forth. The speaker went on to characterize the main measures envisaged by the above-mentioned CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree. In terms of general direction in demographic policy, the measures should be differentiated as a function of the specific conditions in each region and republic. Implementation of the broad social program outlined by the 26th CPSU Congress, in particular in the field of demographic policy, will promote normalization of the demographic situation in all regions of the country and insure the further development of production forces.

The report of doctor of economic sciences professor D. Valentey and doctor of economic sciences professor A. Kvashi (Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov) dealt with theoretical problems of demographic policy. It was emphasized in the report that demographic policy has been, is, and will continue to be an element of state social policy.

Soviet demographic science is pivotal in the entire Marxist-Leninist teaching on population studies. In recent years the object of study has been defined as the investigation of the patterns in population reproduction in its sociohistorical context, on the basis of the methodology of dialectical materialism. It should be noted that this has been promoted by improvements in its informational base, namely improving current recording of the population, carrying out a number of sample demographic studies and, finally, population censuses, particularly in 1970 and 1979, conducted by the USSR Central Statistical Administration in accordance with a comprehensive program.

Research on population by a number of the social and natural sciences is being constantly expanded.

The report went on to provide a detailed review of the main tasks in population studies stemming from the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. First, the entire set of questions associated with pursuing an effective demographic policy: second, further research on the theoretical questions of demography; third, criticism of bourgeois concepts on population and demographic policy. The link between these tasks was noted; further development of demographic science should be closely coordinated with practical tasks and the implementation of demographic policy, while criticism of bourgeois concepts is of great importance not only in the ideological struggle but also in the consistent development of demography.

In this connection, for the purpose of systematizing the basic tasks in the field of population, stemming from the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, four major avenues were distinguished and examined: 1--scientific backup for the implementation of an effective demographic policy; 2--strengthening interdisciplinary studies and the development of a body of knowledge on population; 3--the development of Soviet demographic science; 4--criticism of bourgeois demographic concepts, and the party nature of Soviet population studies.

Doctor of economic sciences L.Rybakovskiy (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research) presented a report entitled "Topical Problems in Migration Policy in the USSR," in which it was noted in particular that a number of substantial shifts have occurred in migration processes in the last decades. The most important of them took place during the Seventies. First, the population flow out of regions with labor shortages was reduced. Second, population flow out of the eastern and northern regions of the country was reduced. Third, by the late Seventies a marked drop had been noted in the flow of the rural population into the cities. Fourth, although migration processes in the major cities are improving the demographic situation within the cities since young people predominate among arriving migrants, they are nevertheless leading to an excess outflow of population from small, medium-sized and major cities. Fifth, during the Seventies, the flow of population out of the Central Asian republic was ubiquitous.

Despite certain positive shifts in population migration in the USSR during the 10th Five-Year Plan, the rapporteur said, on the whole these processes are not meeting the requirements of the country's national economic development. First and foremost, the population flow out of a number of regions of Siberia is not being halted.

The phenomenon of the continued population flow out of regions of the country with labor shortages and its flow into regions with an excess labor force, where population growth is taking place is taking place largely through inherent intensive natural growth, remains the most negative at the present time.

Because of this, the significance of working out scientific bases and concrete, practical proposals on effective migration policy and the regulation of territorial population shifts is growing. Studies of the most urgent regional migration problems include conditions for stabilizing the population of regions in the central part of the country, ways of enhancing the establishment of new settlers in the northern and eastern parts of the RSFSR, and possibilities and factors in activating migration mobility among the rural populations of the Central Asian and Transcaucasus republics.

Chief of a USSR Gosplan subdepartment Yu. Paleyev presented a report entitled "Improving Planned Control of Sociodemographic Processes in Development." He dealt in detail with realization of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress to insure an effective demographic policy and the problems of controlling sociodemographic processes at various levels of planning.

Under the conditions of the growing social and long-term directions in planning, science and practice face the particularly acute question of enhancing the level of reliability in demographic forecasts for the country as a whole and particularly at the territorial level, and of developing theory and practice for the regulation of migration processes between regions of the country, and also between the countryside and the city. Improving the effectiveness of demographic policy is associated with improvements in the system of planning indicators for social development, the scientific substantiation for the normativ base, and a more precise orientation of plans for economic and social development to resolve the problems of sociodemographic development.

Doctor of economic sciences professor V. Kostakov (USSR Gosplan Scientific Research Institute of Economics) presented a report entitled "Problems of Matching the Utilization of the the Labor Force with the Aims of Demographic Policy." The last two decades, which have been distinguished by substantial changes in employment, primarily among women, have shown that the utilization of the labor force exerts a marked effect on demographic processes and the conditions of population reproduction. Therefore, utilization of the labor force is an important tool in implementing an effective demographic policy. In order to use this tool skillfully it is necessary to study the interrelationship between the level of employment and demographic development. The field of activity for science is large here. Some of the most important directions in research in this field should be noted. Thus, it is desirable to study the utilization of the labor force through the "prism" of the family, for it is within the family that who and how many will work is decided, and how many children a family will have, taking into account the wife's work.

There must be studies of labor activity and of the level of employment among people throughout their lives: when was training replaced by work? when and for how long is labor activity interrupted? and when, at what age, does the need most frequently arise for a change of profession or work?

The interaction of employment and demographic procsses in conditions of production intesnsification deserves special attention. Technology should undoubtedly improve labor conditions and "tune in" people of different ages, sexes and physical possibilities in every way, and penetrate primarily where there are large numbers of women and older individuals. Under the conditions of intensification, labor intensiveness is also important, as are efficient working time and the strict observance of labor discipline. High production standards and labor organization constitute an important means for dealing with phenomena such as alcoholism.

Research on occupational training for workers in those kinds of activities closely associated with people's health is exceptionally important: medical personnel and workers in creches and kindergartens and in public catering.

A deep working of problems in the utilization of the labor force is required within sociodemographic groups (young people, women, men, middle-aged individuals and individuals at preretirement and retirement ages).

Candidate of economic sciences A. Volkov (USSR Central Statistical Administration Scientific Research Institute) presented a report entitled "The Family as the Subject of Demographic Policy." Having pointed out that strengthening of the family was named in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress as the primary direction outlined for an effective demographic policy, he characterized the main trends in the demographic development of the family in our country (the relatively low level of celibacy, the increase in recent years in the numbers of young families, the existence of local disproportions in the numbers of males and females, the increase in the numbers of individuals living outside the family, the increase in one-parent families consisting of mothers with children, resulting from the difficulties of divorced and widowed women to marry a second time, and also the increase in the numbers of families with few children).

The profound social and economic changes that have taken place in our country have led to the transformation of the family and a substantial change in its social function. Today's small urban family, in which both spouses usually work is becoming typical for most of the country, and outside the home the source of income for a family is the personal labor of each member of the family, while they come together for domestic and leisure activities; outside the family each family member is involved in different nonfamily institutions which affect his or her situation and behavior. This type of family corresponds with the present organization of social production with a high degree of collectivization and division of labor, and with the specific conditions of urban life. The transformation of the family is the natural consequence of socialist industrialization and urbanization, the changes in the position of women, and the transformation of marriage into a voluntary union between equal partners. Together with the changes in the function of the family there have been changes in the nature of internal family links and the role of children within the family and of the family itself within the system of society's social values. The family has become more vulnerable and brittle. Having considered the features of the family as a specific subject of demographic policy, the rapporteur pointed out the directions for action in the field of helping the family. In his opinion, one of the most important prerequisites

for strengthening the family is enhancing the role of the family and educating children in the system of society's social values, the essential recognition of the labor involved in bearing children and educating them for socially useful work, and overcoming the negative attitudes toward the family and family life as something contradicting the interests of production. At the same time, the family must not be regarded merely as the supplier of working hands, nor the low birth rate merely a threat to the replacement of the labor force in the future. The family and children represent one of the highest moral values of socialist society, an integral part of the socialist way of life. Small numbers of children leave unsatisfied one of people's most important spiritual requirements. Making it is easier for a family to have the number of children it desires, primarily by means of combining maternal functions with participation by women in social production, will insure unity of demographic interests for the family and for society. The rapporteur emphasized the need also to develop a model of the family of the future as a landmark in demographic policy, to expand research on the family and to adopt a long-term, comprehensive program for the development and reinforcement of the family.

Seven sections operated at the conference: "Theoretical Problems of Demographic Policy," "Improving Demographic Policy in the Field of Forming and Developing the Family," "Demographic Policy in the Field of Strengthening Public Health," "Problems of Reproduction of the Labor Force within the System of Demographic Policy," "Urgent Problems of Migration Policy in the USSR," "Problems of Resettlement and the Consideration of These Problems in the Implementation of Demographic Policy" and "Regional and Organizational Aspects of Demographic Policy: Theory and Practice."

The following presented review reports in the sections: candidate of economic sciences V. Steshenko (Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics), candidate of economic sciences I. Gerasimova (USSR Academy of Sciences Central Insitute of Economic Mathematics), doctor of medical sciences M. Bednyy (RSFSR Minstry of Health), doctor of economic sciences V. Onikiyenko (Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Council for the Study of Production Forces), candidate of economic sciences L. Makarova (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Studies), doctor of economic sciences G. Ftomov (Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Council for the Study of Production Forces) and candidate of economic sciences S. Pirozhkov (Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics).

Urgent problems of demographic policy and tasks in the planned control of sociodemographic development and ways to improve demographic policy in a socialist society were discussed at the section and plenary sessions. Questions of demographic policy in the field of forming and developing the family, strengthening public health, regional problems of population reproduction and so forth were at the center of attention.

Recommendations were adopted at the conference whose implementation will promote the further development of demographic science and the drawing up of measures to activate socialist demographic policy.

9642
CSO: 1828/98

REASONS FOR LOW BIRTH RATE EXAMINED

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Feb 83 p 2

[Article by Victor Perevedentsev, candidate of economic sciences: "A Sociologist studies the problem: The Third Child in the Family"]

[Text] People who are not involved with demography usually assume that two births per family is enough for normal population development. Is this a fact? Demographers have been well aware for a long time that a third child is absolutely necessary for the demographic well-being of a country.

What is meant by demographic well-being? There is a perfectly exact criterion. It is the boundary separating broad reproduction of the population from narrow.

Under contemporary conditions, approximately 260 births in 100 families who can have children are necessary for simple reproduction. Why specifically 260 and not 200? There are many reasons. Not all women marry, not all married women are capable of having children, there are always more boys born than girls, and not all chidren live to be parents.

Moreover, from the standpoint of economics even more children than this are necessary: approximately 300 children from 100 families.

Society, then, needs the third child. In the meantime he is disappearing before our eyes. In 1965 for every 100 births in the RSFSR there were 29 children born after the second child, whereas in 1980 there were only 12. At the end of the 60's the birth rate in the republic was such that in the future there will be approximately 860 children to replace 1000 people of the parents' generation. What does this mean? It means this.

When today's children attain the age of parenthood, there will be a lot fewer people of that age than there are now. The number of elderly (older than 60) and old (older than 65) people will increase dramatically. If the present birth rate is maintained, the number of deaths will inevitably exceed the number of births, i.e. the population will decrease. It is, therefore, advisable to increase the birth rate significantly. Is this possible, and if so how can it be done?

Many assume that the problem of the birth rate is "as easy as pie," (from a reader's letter), that is is obvious and has nothing to do with science. It is a question, they say, of wages, housing, and room in children's establishments. Every now and then you hear: "I'd have another one if I had a little more money,"; "I'd have more children if I had a little bigger apartment," etc. These statements sound plausible. They are not, however, always true. The relationship of economic incomes and living conditions to family welfare and consequently to the birth rate exists, but it is by no means direct or automatic. Specialists are particularly well aware that there are fewer children in families with higher incomes. Let us say, then, that highly paid skilled workers have fewer children than unskilled laborers.

Let us try to discern the specific reasons why most people do not want to have more than two children at this time.

First of all, mortality in general and childhood mortality in particular have decreased abruptly. Whereas the average life expectancy in the country was 47 before the war of 1941-1945, it rose to 70 toward the middle of the 60's. One hundred eighty two out of 1000 newborns died during the first year of life in 1940, while around 25 out of 1000 died in the first year a quarter of a century later. Now even parents of only children have grounds for assuming that their children will outlive them. People are not bothered by the fear of being alone in their old age.

Secondly, parents are less concerned about the family's chief wage earner in old age, because pension security has improved significantly. In many cases, retirees continue to give financial aid to their grown children, and even to their grandchildren. Thus, economic incentives for child-bearing have essentially lost their impact.

Thirdly there have been significant changes in the systems of what people want in general, causing children to relinquish their "peak" position in the value system. Thus, if they want one child to have practically everything, even before the second one they can set values related to work, official advancement, economic well-being, leisure, etc. Reasons come up: first a car (cottage, cooperative) or a dissertation, or getting a diploma, and then...

The overall involvement of women in public production has had a tremendous inhibiting effect on the birth rate. In this regard, let us not forget that as always the main household responsibility remains on women's shoulders.

The list of specific reasons could go on for a long time, but it appears that enough has been said. I will add only that all of these causes are interrelated and interlinked with one another, often reinforcing each other.

We should mention that the majority of changes resulting in the reduced birth rate are in and of themselves extremely beneficial, and can be considered great achievements for our society (reduction in mortality rate, good social security, growth of education, etc.). It would be absurd to

renounce these achievements in the name of an increase in the birth rate. Some thought should be given, however, to the factors that could successfully be weighed against them in solving the problem of the third child.

Let us emphasize that there is no basis from a demographic point of view for aiming for a high birth rate, for large families' three children per family is all that is necessary, and it stands to reason that a family of three children is not a large one. Demographers feel that a large family starts with the fifth child.

What steps can and should be taken?

We will begin by forming young families. It has been well-known for a long time that the earlier a family starts out, the more children there are (not counting exceptions, of course). We often hear of the supposedly large number of people who marry too early. A demographer would have difficulty agreeing with this. The average age today for entering into a first marriage is 22-23 for women and 24-25 for men. This is too late rather than too early. This is a large number of late marriages. Suffice it to say that every fourth man does not have his family in the years from 23-30. This seems to be where the great "birth rate reserves" are. There are many reasons for first marriages starting too late. Some of them can be substantially controlled, or even eliminated, such as the undoubtedly great significance of the disproportionate sex distribution of young people in a number of regions of the country. Young women clearly predominate in the "textile" cities and young men in the large new construction projects and the cities and settlements of the north; there is a great "bride" shortage in many rural districts. The resources that we are presently using for a national economic plan balanced according to work area locale are clearly inadequate.

It is known that the number of children in a family is closely related to its stability. The more divorces there are, the fewer children. In recent years in the country as a whole, one marriage in three ends in divorce, with mainly young couples separating. Thus one third of divorces occur in families that have been in existence for less than a year, and another third in families that have existed for one to five year. In other words, at the current rate of divorce approximately one in eight families does not last for a year; one in four does not last five years. It is a fact, however, that divorces are only an external manifestation of relations within the family. There is no reason to believe that these relations are good and advantageous from the standpoint of the birth rate in all families that stay together. As regards the "decisive third child" these relationships can and must improve significantly. The way to do this is through organized preparation of young people for future family life. A lot can be done in this regard by the school where young people must be educated in the spirit of social equality between the sexes, specifically equality and not equal rights which, as everyone knows, have already existed in our country for 65 years. In fact, the work overload of women with families is due in large measure to the fact that more often than not they "pull the family load" all alone, receiving almost no help with housework from husbands.

It is clear that the arrival of one more family member--all other things being equal--cannot help but show up in the economic level of family life, and that this reduction will show up more appreciably in a relatively small family. In fact, the addition of a fourth person to three (i.e., a second child) is not at all the same as, let's say, adding a seventh to six. This means that it would be extremely beneficial for raising the birth rate if the family's standard of living were not reduced by the arrival of the next child, or at least if it were reduced as little as possible. And this means that the child grants now in existence are necessary: parents of three or more children should not have to suffer for being "more conscious" than the rest.

It also stands to reason that it is very important to improve the young family's housing situation. Much has been done in this regard. The housing situation of the overall population is rapidly improving. Since the middle of the 50's the average total living area provided for an urban dweller has continually increased by 0.2 square meters per year. In other words, over two decades the dimensions of one person's living quarters have increased by five square meters, in a family of four persons, by 20 meters. While in themiddle of the 50's the overwhelming majority of city dwellers lived in communal apartments, now more than 80 percent have their own apartments. The level of engineering equipment for housing has improved dramatically. A new dwelling is now built, as a rule, with the full "set" of conveniences.

The housing situation for young people, however, still leaves much to be desired. As the reader well knows, the main criterion for determining one's place in the housing priority is the length of uninterrupted work at a given enterprise, in a given organization. But young people cannot have a long duration of service simply because of their youth. According to a special survey conducted, approximately half of all families starting out experience an acute housing need: young marrieds are forced to "rent" rooms, to stay in different dormitories, to live crowded together with the parents of one of the spouses, etc.

It appears that the young married housing situation can improve substantially if the cooperative living structure is broadly developed by significantly relaxing the conditions for young peoples' admission to the housing. It also makes sense to give some thought to using living area surplusses occurring in mature, shrinking families to improve the housing situation of young families. There are also other resources for improving the situation of young families, important from the standpoint of the birth rate. In conclusion it should be said that we must create conditions so that families would and could have as many children as society needs.

Development of an effective and comprehensive program for optimizing the birth rate and population reproduction is particularly necessary today. Unfortunately, however, there is not one major demographic scientific institution charged with the sound development of the scientific bases of demographic policy. Up until now, establishment of a demographics institute as a part of the USSR Academy of Science has not been successful. I recall that there were two such institutes in our country in the 30's.

The CPSU 26th Congress projected an entire system of priority measures designed to increase the birth rate and improve the education of the coming generation; the accomplishment of these measures should have a positive effect on the demographic situation. These are necessary measures. Simple population reproduction is the line that must not be retreated beyond. In order to correct the situation, an entire system of sound measures designed to elevate the birth rate must be taken. The objective conditions for this exist.

12262
CSO: 1828/93

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON FAMILY SIZE FOR USSR AND UNION REPUBLICS PUBLISHED

Moscow VESTNIK STATISTIKI in Russian No. 2, Feb 83 pp 58-80

II. DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN UP TO 16 YEARS OF AGE (based on data from a one time survey sampling of 310,000 families of office workers, laborers and kolkhoz workers in September 1981 in percentages)

1. Families of Office Workers and Laborers

	All Families Having Children up to 16 Years	Of Those Families With				
		1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 or More Children
USSR-in all	100	57.2	32.8	6.2	1.9	1.9
in urban areas	100	61.3	32.3	4.5	1.1	0.8
in rural areas	100	43.8	34.2	11.9	4.6	5.5
RSFSR-in all	100	62.3	32.3	4.2	0.8	0.4
in urban areas	100	65.0	31.4	3.1	0.4	0.1
in rural areas	100	51.9	35.8	8.5	2.4	1.4
Ukrainian SSR-in all	100	62.0	33.6	3.8	0.5	0.1
in urban areas	100	63.7	32.7	3.1	0.4	0.1
in rural areas	100	52.5	38.5	7.4	1.1	0.5
Belorussian SSR-in all	100	55.9	37.4	5.5	0.8	0.4
in urban areas	100	59.3	36.2	3.8	0.4	0.3
in rural areas	100	43.8	41.7	11.5	2.4	0.6
Uzbek SSR-in all	100	30.9	27.2	18.5	9.5	13.9
in urban areas	100	38.5	30.6	15.6	7.8	7.5
in rural areas	100	22.0	23.2	21.8	11.4	21.6
Kazakh SSR-in all	100	44.7	33.8	11.6	4.6	5.3
in urban areas	100	53.4	34.4	8.2	2.3	1.7
in rural areas	100	32.5	32.9	16.5	7.8	10.3

	All Families Having Children up to 16 Years	Of Those Families With				
		1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 or More Children
USSR-in all	100	44.7	41.2	11.1	2.3	0.7
in urban areas	100	47.0	42.0	9.0	1.7	0.3
in rural areas	100	39.3	39.3	15.9	3.7	1.8
RSFSR-in all	100	35.7	29.1	18.6	8.3	8.3
in urban areas	100	43.8	32.3	15.7	4.8	3.4
in rural areas	100	26.3	25.5	21.9	12.2	14.1
Ukrainian SSR-in all	100	54.5	37.8	6.4	0.6	0.7
in urban areas	100	56.3	37.8	5.3	0.4	0.2
in rural areas	100	46.7	37.6	11.3	1.6	2.8
Belorussian SSR-in all	100	53.6	35.6	7.9	1.6	1.3
in urban areas	100	60.1	35.1	4.3	0.2	0.3
in rural areas	100	42.2	36.5	14.2	3.9	3.2
Uzbek SSR-in all	100	63.3	30.8	4.7	0.8	0.4
in urban areas	100	66.1	29.2	4.4	0.2	0.1
in rural areas	100	51.6	37.3	6.0	3.4	1.7
Kazakh SSR-in all	100	38.2	32.2	15.2	6.9	7.5
in urban areas	100	46.1	3.4	10.8	5.8	3.3
in rural areas	100	28.5	30.1	20.6	8.3	12.5
Georgian SSR-in all	100	27.9	25.9	15.6	11.3	19.3
in urban areas	100	34.4	29.2	13.2	9.4	13.8
in rural areas	100	16.4	20.4	19.6	14.8	28.8
Azerbaijan SSR-in all	100	34.6	38.0	19.2	5.6	2.6
in urban areas	100	36.6	39.8	18.3	4.2	1.1
in rural areas	100	24.5	29.0	23.4	12.8	10.3
Lithuanian SSR-in all	100	31.3	28.7	15.5	11.2	13.3
in urban areas	100	33.1	29.9	15.3	10.8	10.9
in rural areas	100	25.3	24.5	16.1	12.8	21.3
Moldavian SSR-in all	100	50.1	42.5	5.8	0.9	0.7
in urban areas	100	53.3	41.7	4.3	0.4	0.3
in rural areas	100	38.6	45.3	11.2	3.0	1.9

Families of Kolkhoz Workers						
	All Families Having Children up to 16 Years	Of Those Families With				
		1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 or More Children
USSR-in all	100	39.8	30.7	14.2	6.6	8.7
RSFSR-in all	100	47.9	34.0	12.3	3.4	2.4
Ukrainian SSR-in all	100	50.1	36.0	10.3	2.4	1.2
Belorussian SSR-in all	100	49.0	33.8	11.5	3.8	1.9
Uzbek SSR-in all	100	16.1	18.9	21.0	15.3	28.7
Kazakh SSR-in all	100	25.0	25.1	18.1	13.0	18.8
Georgian SSR-in all	100	37.9	33.6	19.5	6.4	2.6
Azerbaijan SSR-in all	100	21.1	21.3	21.4	16.0	20.2
Lithuanian SSR-in all	100	48.6	37.0	11.2	2.7	0.5
Moldavian SSR-in all	100	43.2	32.3	14.2	7.2	3.1
Latvian SSR-in all	100	42.6	39.9	12.8	2.9	1.8
Kirghiz SSR-in all	100	23.1	19.2	20.0	13.7	24.0
Tajik SSR-in all	100	12.1	17.1	17.4	17.6	35.8
Armenian SSR-in all	100	31.6	27.8	21.1	11.4	8.1
Turkmen SSR-in all	100	20.1	18.2	20.4	14.7	26.6
Estonian SSR-in all	100	42.4	37.0	14.1	5.1	1.4

I. NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND THEIR GROUPING
BY SIZE IN AUTONOMOUS REPUBLICS AND OBLASTS*

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
UKRAINIAN SSR												
Vinnitskaya Oblast	556,009	214,187	152,801	119,180	48,456	15,584	3,974	1,193	407	227	2,405	3.1
Urban population	183,386	58,672	60,283	46,455	13,033	3,542	909	301	126	65	689	3.2
Rural population	372,623	155,515	92,518	72,725	35,423	12,042	3,065	892	281	162	1,716	3.1
Volynskaya Oblast	258,524	75,615	63,572	59,969	32,071	16,165	6,630	2,574	1,107	821	8,841	3.6
Urban population	103,845	28,104	31,037	29,815	10,108	3,262	952	333	130	104	1,141	3.4
Rural population	154,679	47,511	32,535	30,154	21,963	12,903	5,678	2,241	977	717	7,700	3.7
Voroshilovgradskaya Oblast	787,858	268,115	253,365	183,475	58,842	17,261	4,445	1,498	511	346	3,750	3.1
Urban population	667,416	221,070	223,005	158,810	46,888	12,684	3,237	1,078	382	262	2,864	3.1
Rural population	120,442	47,045	30,360	24,665	11,954	4,577	1,208	420	129	84	886	3.2
Dnepropetovskaya Oblast	1,013,609	336,649	315,816	249,461	79,596	22,581	6,077	2,020	794	615	6,804	3.2
Urban population	813,489	254,182	266,827	208,808	60,497	16,224	4,346	1,502	616	487	5,426	3.2
Rural population	200,120	82,467	48,989	40,653	19,099	6,357	1,731	518	178	128	1,378	3.1
Donetskaya Oblast	1,459,481	480,738	468,880	355,264	109,779	32,163	7,919	2,898	1,040	800	8,738	3.2
Urban population	1,298,988	419,877	426,665	320,387	94,188	27,063	6,619	2,559	921	709	7,746	3.2
Rural population	160,493	60,861	42,215	34,877	15,591	5,100	1,300	339	119	91	992	3.2
Zhitomirskaya Oblast	427,023	149,761	114,158	96,782	42,856	15,607	5,305	1,640	572	342	3,668	3.3
Urban population	188,673	58,427	59,015	50,273	15,355	3,944	1,088	340	138	93	1,009	3.2
Rural population	238,350	91,334	55,143	46,509	27,501	11,663	4,217	1,300	434	249	2,659	3.3
Zakarpatskaya Oblast	287,956	64,910	73,970	76,093	39,840	19,476	7,776	3,249	1,397	1,245	13,601	3.7
Urban population	111,033	28,631	34,208	30,869	10,739	3,957	1,404	606	315	304	3,375	3.4
Rural population	176,923	36,279	39,762	45,224	29,101	15,519	6,372	2,643	1,082	941	10,226	3.9

*Continuation of publication of the results of the census in VESTNIK STATISTIKI Magazine (for the beginning see Nos. 2, 6-12, for 1980, Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12 for 1981 and Nos. 1, 7, 9, 10, for 1982; data on the number and grouping of families by size in autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts in the RSFSR were published in No. 10 for 1982

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
Zaporozhskaya Oblast	540,207	176,829	166,228	132,121	46,067	13,748	3,374	1,131	422	287	3,123	3.2
Urban population	381,584	116,266	125,426	98,466	29,911	8,164	2,048	765	311	227	2,485	3.2
Rural population	158,623	60,563	40,802	33,655	16,156	5,584	1,326	366	111	60	638	3.2
Ivano-Frankovskaya Oblast	338,872	94,668	86,055	84,259	42,811	19,789	7,212	2,508	968	602	6,414	3.6
Urban population	122,702	32,791	36,801	35,753	11,614	3,864	1,150	423	181	125	1,337	3.4
Rural population	216,170	61,877	49,254	48,506	31,197	15,925	6,062	2,085	787	477	5,077	3.6
Kiev	567,193	163,281	204,120	150,107	36,192	9,521	2,583	850	323	216	2,314	3.2
Kievskaya Oblast	514,807	173,563	137,050	126,238	51,853	18,049	5,146	1,743	676	489	5,254	3.3
Urban population	228,292	65,771	70,203	64,275	19,402	5,806	1,712	653	266	204	2,204	3.3
Rural population	286,515	107,792	66,847	61,963	32,451	12,243	3,434	1,090	410	285	3,050	3.3
Kirovogradskaya Oblast	354,971	141,300	102,049	76,158	25,731	7,026	1,753	604	209	141	1,518	3.1
Urban population	181,729	62,141	59,992	43,449	11,997	2,988	723	280	92	67	726	3.1
Rural population	173,242	79,159	42,057	32,709	13,734	4,038	1,030	324	117	74	792	3.0
Krimskaya Oblast	592,191	189,397	193,379	142,628	46,665	13,877	3,935	1,419	554	337	3,627	3.2
Urban population	393,091	132,450	135,911	90,772	24,809	6,527	1,627	602	250	143	1,543	3.1
Rural population	199,100	56,947	57,468	51,856	21,856	7,350	2,308	817	304	194	2,084	3.4
L'vovskaya Oblast	630,618	163,729	159,279	160,547	80,170	40,291	16,326	6,399	2,362	1,515	16,093	3.6
Urban population	339,302	88,410	100,749	99,778	33,835	11,086	3,309	1,264	506	365	3,936	3.4
Rural population	291,316	75,319	58,530	60,769	46,335	29,205	13,017	5,135	1,856	1,150	12,157	3.9
Nikolaeyevskaya Oblast	347,530	119,429	106,212	81,769	28,393	8,241	2,256	767	261	202	2,223	3.2
Urban population	208,592	65,755	70,115	51,527	15,293	4,142	1,118	393	139	110	1,233	3.2
Rural population	138,938	53,674	36,097	30,242	13,100	4,099	1,138	374	122	92	990	3.2
Odesskaya Oblast	677,554	225,845	206,691	158,703	57,562	19,782	5,840	1,847	689	595	6,449	3.2
Urban population	407,240	128,545	137,250	98,756	29,969	8,713	2,461	886	338	322	3,530	3.2
Rural population	270,314	97,300	69,441	59,947	27,593	11,069	3,379	961	351	273	2,919	3.3

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people: Number of Families	10 or more people: Members of Families in Them	
Poltavskaya Oblast	481,436	183,923	135,413	104,824	40,681	12,728	2,735	751	234	147	1,566	3.1
Urban population	235,606	75,110	76,589	60,426	17,413	4,582	990	308	115	73	788	3.2
Rural population	245,830	108,813	58,824	44,398	23,268	8,146	1,745	443	119	74	778	3.1
Rovenskaya Oblast	274,920	76,713	66,533	65,774	35,212	17,364	7,318	3,196	1,508	1,302	13,981	3.6
Urban population	97,887	24,996	29,349	29,144	9,759	3,186	904	317	127	105	1,131	3.4
Rural population	177,033	51,717	37,184	36,630	25,453	14,178	6,414	2,879	1,381	1,197	12,850	3.8
Sumskaya Oblast	396,063	140,805	108,761	84,932	40,489	15,282	4,066	1,133	378	217	2,324	3.2
Urban population	206,974	64,502	65,395	51,523	18,136	5,345	1,359	445	165	104	1,126	3.2
Rural population	189,089	76,303	43,366	33,409	22,353	9,937	2,707	688	213	113	1,198	3.3
Ternopol'skaya Oblast	295,765	87,863	71,543	68,976	38,639	19,403	6,516	1,981	560	284	3,009	3.5
Urban population	89,335	23,878	26,020	26,394	8,774	2,998	864	268	82	57	599	3.4
Rural population	206,430	63,985	45,523	42,582	29,865	16,405	5,652	1,713	478	227	2,410	3.6
Kharkov'skaya Oblast	820,257	271,091	250,070	192,578	74,042	23,697	5,894	1,855	627	403	4,376	3.2
Urban population	607,798	186,216	198,408	150,526	51,492	15,357	3,788	1,290	443	278	3,048	3.2
Rural population	212,459	84,875	51,662	42,052	22,550	8,340	2,106	565	184	125	1,328	3.2
Khersonskaya Oblast	316,243	97,108	95,055	79,418	30,489	9,814	2,798	929	387	245	2,644	3.3
Urban population	181,041	53,462	58,214	46,743	15,475	4,889	1,401	491	234	132	1,448	3.3
Rural population	135,202	43,646	36,841	32,675	15,014	4,925	1,397	438	153	113	1,196	3.3
Khmel'nitskaya Oblast	412,449	140,783	108,872	91,467	45,455	18,269	5,254	1,584	465	300	3,180	3.3
Urban population	145,338	42,668	47,396	38,723	11,773	3,356	898	321	112	91	990	3.2
Rural population	267,111	98,115	61,476	52,744	33,682	14,913	4,356	1,263	353	209	2,190	3.4
Cherkasskaya Oblast	431,291	166,609	121,056	95,107	35,081	10,129	2,249	681	210	169	1,840	3.1
Urban population	186,613	61,296	60,864	47,094	12,724	3,259	861	300	114	101	1,100	3.1
Rural population	244,678	105,313	60,192	48,013	22,357	6,870	1,388	381	96	68	740	3.1

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
Chrenigovskaya Oblast	411,903	155,657	112,484	86,538	39,372	13,496	3,216	783	232	125	1,326	3.2
Urban population	178,139	56,991	56,806	44,910	14,320	3,781	931	257	92	51	539	3.2
Rural population	233,764	98,666	55,678	41,628	25,052	9,715	2,285	526	140	74	787	3.2
Chernovitskaya Oblast	237,135	77,603	65,782	52,294	24,732	10,006	3,766	1,551	775	626	6,778	3.4
Urban population	88,668	28,461	28,663	21,073	6,959	2,231	717	284	149	131	1,451	3.2
Rural population	148,467	49,142	37,119	31,221	17,773	7,775	3,049	1,267	626	495	5,327	3.5
BELORUSSIAN SSR												
Brestskaya Oblast	363,390	118,882	99,123	89,129	35,824	13,207	4,550	1,629	633	413	4,433	3.3
Urban population	161,283	43,907	51,849	48,706	12,632	3,016	715	281	104	73	771	3.3
Rural population	202,107	74,975	47,274	40,423	23,192	10,191	3,835	1,348	529	340	3,662	3.3
Vitebskaya Oblast	376,524	128,690	115,846	88,479	30,524	8,878	2,706	872	320	209	2,278	3.2
Urban population	206,035	57,072	71,853	56,114	15,803	3,662	971	331	143	86	924	3.2
Rural population	170,489	71,618	43,993	32,365	14,721	5,216	1,735	541	177	123	1,354	3.1
Gomel'skaya Oblast	420,570	135,075	117,941	103,851	41,158	14,801	5,060	1,687	601	396	4,221	3.3
Urban population	218,303	59,295	69,223	64,013	18,760	4,843	1,341	472	203	153	1,653	3.3
Rural population	202,267	75,780	48,718	39,838	22,398	9,958	3,719	1,215	398	243	2,568	3.3
Grodnenskaya Oblast	303,063	99,995	83,336	74,109	30,514	10,496	3,157	964	299	193	2,026	3.3
Urban population	127,329	32,728	41,424	38,697	10,834	2,622	674	224	70	56	594	3.3
Rural population	175,734	67,267	41,912	35,412	19,680	7,874	2,483	740	229	137	1,432	3.3
Minsk	322,767	79,246	114,263	98,585	23,020	5,298	1,485	529	215	126	1,384	3.3
Minskaya Oblast	413,126	134,964	112,902	100,920	41,475	15,056	5,220	1,644	571	374	4,013	3.3
Urban population	146,118	37,839	47,029	44,782	12,190	2,993	866	265	100	54	588	3.3
Rural population	267,008	97,125	65,873	56,138	29,285	12,063	4,354	1,379	471	320	3,425	3.3

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
Mogilevskaya Oblast	327,834	109,166	93,817	78,815	30,286	10,347	3,565	1,181	423	234	2,493	3.3
Urban population	180,114	48,429	58,535	51,921	15,395	4,030	1,137	408	157	102	1,118	3.3
Rural population	147,720	60,737	35,282	26,894	14,891	6,317	2,428	773	266	132	1,375	3.2
UZBEK SSR												
Karakalpakskaya ASSR	136,950	9,980	13,331	16,492	16,569	17,153	16,591	15,432	11,860	19,542	221,102	6.4
Urban population	61,446	5,691	7,420	8,973	8,072	7,602	6,912	6,028	4,417	6,331	70,997	5.9
Rural population	75,504	4,289	5,911	7,519	8,497	9,551	9,679	9,404	7,443	13,211	150,105	6.8
Andizhanskaya Oblast	235,050	33,228	30,274	33,866	30,560	29,660	25,252	21,167	13,761	17,282	191,439	5.5
Urban population	72,156	12,802	11,929	13,046	9,372	8,241	5,789	4,622	2,618	3,737	42,002	4.9
Rural population	162,894	20,426	18,345	20,820	21,188	21,419	19,463	16,545	11,143	13,545	149,437	5.7
Bukharskaya Oblast	212,318	27,832	31,521	34,420	25,087	22,372	18,878	17,176	13,102	21,930	245,385	5.6
Urban population	89,519	15,855	20,032	21,016	10,784	7,663	4,567	3,858	2,047	3,697	41,408	4.5
Rural population	122,799	11,977	11,489	13,404	14,303	14,709	14,311	13,318	11,055	18,233	203,977	6.4
Dzhizakskaya Oblast	79,622	7,096	8,563	11,134	9,680	9,576	8,404	8,103	6,282	10,784	120,600	6.2
Urban population	25,195	3,548	4,013	5,260	3,393	2,816	1,779	1,603	1,057	1,726	19,221	5.1
Rural population	54,427	3,548	4,550	5,874	6,287	6,760	6,625	6,500	5,225	9,058	101,379	6.7
Kashkadar'inskaya Oblast	170,586	14,894	17,165	21,332	19,841	20,086	18,794	17,918	14,866	25,690	290,921	6.4
Urban population	48,709	6,606	7,531	8,922	6,343	5,226	4,125	3,570	2,530	3,856	42,922	5.3
Rural population	121,877	8,288	9,634	12,410	13,498	14,860	14,669	14,348	12,336	21,834	247,999	6.8
Namanganskaya Oblast	185,023	22,559	22,049	25,031	24,804	24,127	21,461	17,811	11,947	15,234	170,550	5.7
Urban population	65,551	9,728	9,611	10,047	8,388	7,732	6,441	5,108	3,427	5,069	58,082	5.4
Rural population	119,472	12,831	12,438	14,984	16,416	16,395	15,020	12,703	8,520	10,165	112,468	5.9
Samarkandskaya Oblast	293,335	34,981	36,465	43,659	37,457	35,802	29,936	26,593	19,296	29,146	322,821	5.7
Urban population	126,994	20,227	20,582	23,784	17,139	14,573	10,280	8,036	4,846	7,527	84,520	5.0
Rural population	166,341	14,754	15,883	19,875	20,318	21,229	19,656	18,557	14,450	21,619	238,301	6.3

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
Sukhandar'inskaya Oblast	143,903	14,647	16,886	19,337	17,370	16,471	15,120	14,524	11,480	18,068	200,089	6.0
Urban population	32,233	5,429	6,037	6,376	4,002	2,909	2,179	1,874	1,313	2,114	23,270	4.9
Rural population	111,670	9,218	10,849	12,961	13,368	13,562	12,941	12,650	10,167	15,954	176,819	6.4
Syrdar'inskaya Oblast	78,295	10,077	11,486	13,880	10,536	8,602	6,546	5,746	4,291	7,131	80,285	5.4
Urban population	29,258	5,295	5,985	7,147	4,197	2,717	1,374	1,084	585	874	9,643	4.4
Rural population	49,037	4,782	5,501	6,733	6,339	5,885	5,172	4,662	3,706	6,257	70,642	6.1
Tashkent	367,691	74,218	81,763	92,842	46,364	29,404	15,610	11,353	5,877	10,260	119,539	4.2
Tashkentskaya Oblast	335,843	52,817	57,506	62,492	44,041	34,207	26,696	21,213	14,973	21,898	243,775	5.0
Urban population	167,015	35,131	38,355	39,292	21,721	12,525	7,472	5,014	3,191	4,314	47,982	4.2
Rural population	168,828	17,686	19,151	23,200	22,320	21,682	19,224	16,199	11,782	17,584	195,793	5.9
Ferganskaya Oblast	300,957	44,042	42,540	46,119	39,080	35,814	31,229	25,278	16,735	20,120	223,262	5.3
Urban population	113,877	23,990	23,265	22,864	14,110	10,160	7,286	5,094	3,043	4,065	46,305	4.4
Rural population	187,080	20,052	19,275	23,255	24,970	25,654	23,943	20,184	13,692	16,055	176,957	5.9
Khorezmskaya Oblast	107,920	9,199	9,732	11,513	11,712	12,216	12,241	11,650	9,522	20,135	233,261	6.7
Urban population	24,698	3,138	3,617	4,027	3,177	2,804	2,219	1,855	1,330	2,531	29,116	5.6
Rural population	83,222	6,061	6,115	7,486	8,535	9,412	10,022	9,795	8,192	17,604	204,145	7.0
KAZAKH SSR												
Aktyubinskaya Oblast	134,023	25,552	30,315	29,963	17,416	10,605	7,226	5,435	3,600	3,911	42,262	4.3
Urban population	69,730	15,794	19,192	18,049	8,336	3,762	2,057	1,199	691	650	7,033	3.8
Rural population	64,293	9,758	11,123	11,914	9,080	6,843	5,169	4,236	2,909	3,261	35,229	5.0
Alma-Ata	229,601	63,351	69,720	58,573	23,039	8,663	3,339	1,529	693	694	7,694	3.4

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
Alma-Atinskaya Oblast	182,166	34,173	38,768	39,929	25,377	15,990	10,808	7,327	4,672	5,122	55,454	4.4
Urban population	40,141	10,007	10,759	10,545	4,938	2,033	960	460	218	221	2,395	3.6
Rural population	142,025	24,166	28,009	29,384	20,439	13,957	9,848	6,867	4,454	4,901	53,059	4.6
Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya Oblast	220,989	60,928	61,648	52,920	22,676	10,134	5,412	3,309	2,002	1,960	21,053	3.6
Urban population	144,200	42,322	44,983	37,280	12,967	4,154	1,440	597	248	209	2,223	3.3
Rural population	76,789	18,606	16,665	15,640	9,709	5,980	3,972	2,712	1,754	1,751	18,830	4.1
Gur'evskaya Oblast	69,709	10,078	12,395	12,902	9,633	7,199	5,758	4,452	3,165	4,127	44,990	5.0
Urban population	44,235	7,274	9,146	9,376	6,334	4,107	2,918	2,061	1,330	1,689	18,462	4.6
Rural population	25,474	2,804	3,249	3,526	3,299	3,092	2,840	2,391	1,835	2,438	26,528	5.8
Dzhambulskaya Oblast	194,673	37,842	41,880	41,776	24,941	16,297	10,923	7,834	5,585	7,595	83,486	4.4
Urban population	98,437	22,927	26,524	25,104	11,797	5,681	2,883	1,601	879	1,041	11,386	3.8
Rural population	96,236	14,915	15,356	16,672	13,144	10,616	8,040	6,233	4,706	6,554	72,100	5.1
Dzhezkazganskaya Oblast	103,301	21,567	27,684	25,060	11,674	6,096	4,056	2,714	1,930	2,520	27,393	4.0
Urban population	84,700	18,942	24,786	22,153	9,212	4,056	2,278	1,361	851	1,061	11,539	3.7
Rural population	18,601	2,625	2,898	2,907	2,462	2,040	1,778	1,353	1,079	1,459	15,854	5.3
Karagandinskaya Oblast	317,354	71,459	96,802	89,077	33,641	13,129	5,971	3,252	1,841	2,182	23,567	3.6
Urban population	276,660	63,553	88,327	80,587	27,889	9,631	3,582	1,603	738	750	8,119	3.5
Rural population	40,694	7,906	8,475	8,490	5,752	3,498	2,389	1,649	1,103	1,432	15,448	4.4
Kzyl-Ordinskaya Oblast	103,430	12,979	19,923	18,840	12,204	9,988	8,800	7,316	5,584	7,796	85,234	5.2
Urban population	70,078	10,394	16,651	15,037	8,045	5,790	4,675	3,611	2,525	3,350	36,679	4.7
Rural population	33,352	2,585	3,272	3,803	4,159	4,198	4,125	3,705	3,059	4,446	48,555	6.3
Kokchetavskaya Oblast	143,080	31,750	34,156	34,705	19,454	10,141	5,660	3,273	1,968	1,973	21,143	4.0
Urban population	51,613	12,707	14,068	13,976	6,261	2,475	1,059	505	264	298	3,219	3.6
Rural population	91,467	19,043	20,088	20,729	13,193	7,666	4,601	2,768	1,704	1,675	17,924	4.2

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
Kustanayskaya Oblast	234,571	56,684	64,274	60,586	28,553	12,286	6,064	3,047	1,652	1,425	15,260	3.7
Urban population	117,708	30,606	36,432	33,438	11,818	3,474	1,190	431	180	139	1,518	3.4
Rural population	116,863	26,078	27,842	27,148	16,735	8,812	4,874	2,616	1,472	1,286	13,742	4.0
Mangyshlakskaya Oblast	51,620	8,501	13,862	13,406	5,548	2,962	2,294	1,784	1,255	2,008	22,130	4.3
Urban population	47,796	8,290	13,570	13,020	5,123	2,506	1,835	1,294	891	1,267	13,845	4.1
Rural population	3,824	211	292	386	425	456	459	490	364	741	8,285	6.9
Pavlodarskaya Oblast	188,689	40,078	48,631	48,881	24,158	11,757	6,523	3,932	2,321	2,408	25,940	3.9
Urban population	113,506	25,653	33,394	33,092	13,196	4,594	1,906	893	380	398	4,331	3.6
Rural population	75,183	14,425	15,237	15,789	10,962	7,163	4,617	3,039	1,941	2,010	21,609	4.4
Severo-Kazakhstanskaya Oblast	141,359	35,314	37,417	35,261	17,300	7,899	3,867	2,126	1,114	1,061	11,343	3.7
Urban population	64,195	16,938	19,176	17,750	6,803	2,224	777	307	122	98	1,065	3.4
Rural population	77,164	18,376	18,241	17,511	10,497	5,675	3,090	1,819	992	963	10,278	3.9
Semipalatinskaya Oblast	170,828	36,279	42,366	38,322	20,081	12,047	8,014	5,792	3,789	4,138	44,581	4.1
Urban population	89,680	21,926	27,488	23,142	8,968	3,938	1,933	1,099	589	597	6,524	3.6
Rural population	81,148	14,353	14,878	15,180	11,113	8,109	6,081	4,693	3,200	3,541	38,057	4.7
Taldy-Kurganskaya Oblast	144,538	29,791	32,202	30,706	18,936	11,997	7,685	5,543	3,565	4,113	44,380	4.3
Urban population	65,068	16,597	17,934	15,967	7,683	3,650	1,637	810	425	365	3,912	3.6
Rural population	79,470	13,194	14,268	14,739	11,253	8,347	6,048	4,733	3,140	3,748	40,468	4.8
Turgayskaya Oblast	59,364	10,604	14,260	14,534	8,240	4,578	2,795	1,826	1,193	1,334	14,438	4.2
Urban population	19,480	3,983	5,895	5,480	2,308	930	455	208	101	120	1,313	3.7
Rural population	39,884	6,621	8,365	9,054	5,932	3,648	2,340	1,618	1,092	1,214	13,125	4.5
Ural'skaya Oblast	127,541	25,678	30,186	28,086	15,997	9,721	6,607	4,757	3,010	3,499	37,554	4.2
Urban population	54,414	13,510	16,720	14,583	5,728	2,141	889	463	195	185	2,005	3.5
Rural population	73,127	12,168	13,466	13,503	10,269	7,580	5,718	4,294	2,815	3,314	35,549	4.8

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people: Number of Families	10 or more people: Members of Families in Them	
Tselinogradskaya Oblast	191,433	41,869	50,502	49,380	24,501	11,875	6,044	3,315	1,954	1,993	21,487	3.8
Urban population	112,297	25,729	33,293	31,487	12,699	4,916	2,036	1,023	518	596	6,538	3.6
Rural population	79,136	16,140	17,209	17,893	11,802	6,959	4,008	2,292	1,436	1,397	14,949	4.2
Chimkentskaya Oblast	285,609	42,177	46,008	52,007	37,236	29,831	22,801	19,830	14,390	21,329	234,660	5.2
Urban population	130,147	26,094	28,102	30,539	16,973	10,937	6,097	4,737	2,781	3,887	42,901	4.3
Rural population	155,462	16,083	17,906	21,468	20,263	18,894	16,704	15,093	11,609	17,442	191,759	5.9
GEORGIAN SSR												
Abkhazskaya Oblast	114,257	26,545	24,899	26,297	17,487	10,166	4,839	2,259	955	810	8,790	3.9
Urban population	55,767	15,699	13,964	13,591	7,022	3,182	1,319	536	231	223	2,430	3.6
Rural population	58,490	10,846	10,935	12,706	10,465	6,984	3,520	1,723	724	587	6,360	4.3
Adzharskaya Oblast	72,959	10,837	12,651	16,028	13,599	9,164	5,410	2,739	1,343	1,188	12,941	4.5
Urban population	36,332	7,555	8,340	9,681	6,065	2,673	1,108	450	245	215	2,376	3.9
Rural population	36,627	3,282	4,311	6,347	7,534	6,491	4,302	2,289	1,098	973	10,565	5.2
Yugo-Osetinskaya Autonomous Oblast	22,910	5,218	4,490	5,144	4,176	2,378	992	320	114	78	830	4.0
Urban population	9,746	1,959	2,171	2,598	1,792	786	265	104	41	30	316	3.9
Rural population	13,164	3,259	2,319	2,546	2,384	1,592	727	216	73	48	514	4.0
Tbilisi*	249,585	53,354	62,045	71,942	37,394	20,308	6,708	3,727	1,609	2,498	28,859	3.9
AZERBAIJAN SSR												
Nakhichevanskaya ASSR	41,640	4,798	5,288	6,074	6,066	5,820	4,921	3,776	2,420	2,477	26,854	5.5
Urban population	11,881	1,651	2,018	2,331	2,124	1,590	1,011	575	280	301	3,328	4.7
Rural population	29,759	3,147	3,270	3,743	3,942	4,230	3,910	3,201	2,140	2,176	23,526	5.8
Nagorno-Karabakhskaya Autonomous Oblast	33,473	6,565	5,272	5,934	5,948	4,438	2,748	1,428	633	507	5,465	4.5
Urban population	14,522	2,379	2,450	3,120	2,999	1,862	967	402	162	181	1,991	4.4
Rural population	18,951	4,186	2,822	2,814	2,949	2,576	1,781	1,026	471	326	3,474	4.6

* Including population centers under the jurisdiction of the city soviet

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people		
										Number of Families	Members of Families in Them	
Baku*	319,404	64,122	64,478	76,902	51,399	30,555	14,357	8,269	3,894	5,428	61,486	4.2
LITHUANIAN SSR												
Vilnius	118,683	32,595	40,194	33,263	9,426	2,218	611	212	84	80	881	3.3
MOLDAVIAN SSR												
Kishinev*	128,066	39,260	46,726	31,603	7,572	1,892	583	229	101	100	1,085	3.1
LATVIAN SSR												
Riga	226,269	79,463	77,473	49,378	14,654	3,827	957	315	124	78	851	3.1
KIRGHIZ SSR												
Frunze	126,969	33,642	36,910	32,332	14,031	5,466	2,384	1,091	532	581	6,540	3.5
Issyk-Kul'skaya Oblast	70,961	12,920	14,359	14,010	9,420	6,411	4,775	3,615	2,539	2,912	31,625	4.6
Urban population	23,812	5,259	6,126	5,790	3,067	1,579	920	518	275	278	3,046	3.9
Rural population	47,149	7,661	8,233	8,220	6,353	4,832	3,855	3,097	2,264	2,634	28,579	5.0
Narynskaya Oblast	38,611	4,293	5,165	5,623	5,116	4,733	4,103	3,478	2,574	3,526	38,411	5.7
Urban population	7,003	910	1,208	1,227	1,020	833	676	475	288	366	4,010	5.1
Rural population	31,608	3,383	3,957	4,396	4,096	3,900	3,427	3,003	2,286	3,160	34,401	5.8
Oshskaya Oblast	270,247	36,305	40,444	42,636	34,287	30,199	26,472	22,558	16,291	21,055	232,386	5.4
Urban population	94,466	19,038	21,643	20,514	11,433	7,452	5,252	3,848	2,359	2,927	32,519	4.3
Rural population	175,781	17,267	18,801	22,122	22,854	22,747	21,220	18,710	13,932	18,128	199,867	6.0

* Including population centers under the jurisdiction of the city soviet

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people: Number of Families	10 or more people: Members of Families in Them	
TAJIK SSR												
Dushanbe*	105,812	24,120	25,408	24,540	12,681	6,555	3,916	2,883	2,045	3,664	41,962	4.1
Kulyabskaya Oblast	69,856	4,728	5,656	6,959	7,630	8,126	8,508	8,047	7,051	13,151	149,563	6.8
Urban population	18,925	1,942	2,219	2,494	2,215	2,103	1,931	1,794	1,479	2,748	31,219	6.2
Rural population	50,931	2,786	3,437	4,465	5,415	6,023	6,577	6,253	5,572	10,403	118,344	7.1
Kurgan-Tyubinskaya Oblast	110,070	11,063	12,670	14,419	12,776	12,131	11,460	10,593	8,943	16,015	181,487	6.2
Urban population	26,569	5,025	5,709	5,705	3,371	2,120	1,468	1,124	753	1,294	14,525	4.5
Rural population	83,501	6,038	6,961	8,714	9,405	10,011	9,992	9,469	8,190	14,721	166,962	6.7
Leninabadskaya Oblast	211,922	30,304	30,585	32,996	27,151	24,269	20,993	17,289	12,211	16,124	179,347	5.4
Urban population	87,825	17,759	18,044	17,998	10,836	7,445	5,491	4,012	2,651	3,589	40,515	4.5
Rural population	124,097	12,545	12,541	14,998	16,315	16,824	15,502	13,277	9,560	12,535	138,832	6.0
Gorno-Badakhshanskaya Oblast	17,149	1,030	1,339	1,496	1,678	1,944	2,060	2,048	1,774	3,780	44,603	7.2
Urban population	2,470	205	260	290	270	308	303	265	220	349	3,955	6.4
Rural population	14,679	825	1,079	1,206	1,408	1,636	1,757	1,783	1,554	3,431	40,648	7.3
ARMENIAN SSR												
Yerevan*	222,445	30,953	36,517	62,455	45,666	27,256	9,655	5,155	1,944	2,844	32,277	4.4
TURKMEN SSR												
Ashkhabad*	65,020	14,361	15,297	15,215	7,749	4,449	2,578	1,869	1,234	2,268	26,141	4.2

* Including population centers under the jurisdiction of the city soviet

Continuation

	Number of Families	In Particular Families Consisting of the Following Living Together										Average Size of the Family (Members of the Family Living Together)
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 People	8 People	9 People	10 or more people: Number of Families	10 or more people: Members of Families in Them	
Ashkhabadskaya Oblast	62,844	6,469	7,668	8,741	7,597	7,155	6,659	5,714	4,860	7,981	89,889	6.0
Urban population	21,509	3,391	339	3,751	2,754	2,200	1,916	1,574	1,215	1,969	22,258	5.4
Rural population	41,335	3,730	4,277	4,990	4,843	4,955	4,743	4,140	3,645	6,012	67,631	6.3
Krasnovodskaya Oblast	61,925	10,837	13,017	12,339	7,295	5,276	4,113	3,238	2,460	3,350	36,551	4.7
Urban population	52,587	9,738	11,924	11,145	6,094	4,153	3,022	2,335	1,737	2,439	26,758	4.5
Rural population	9,338	1,099	1,093	1,194	1,201	1,123	1,091	903	723	911	9,793	5.8
Maryyskaya Oblast	104,328	13,318	14,370	15,211	12,106	11,131	9,951	8,955	7,239	12,047	135,590	5.8
Urban population	40,327	8,176	8,690	8,273	4,638	3,237	2,323	1,758	1,287	1,945	21,796	4.5
Rural population	64,001	5,142	5,680	6,938	7,468	7,894	7,628	7,197	5,952	10,102	113,794	6.5
Tashauzskaya Oblast	78,798	6,035	7,029	8,725	9,403	9,893	9,247	8,818	7,089	12,559	142,742	6.6
Urban population	25,617	2,500	2,950	3,682	3,434	3,283	2,748	2,440	1,742	2,838	31,972	5.9
Rural population	53,181	3,535	4,079	5,043	5,969	6,610	6,499	6,378	5,347	9,721	110,770	6.9
Chardzhouskaya Oblast	102,196	14,733	15,588	16,573	12,726	10,892	9,405	7,991	6,019	8,269	90,935	5.3
Urban population	52,276	9,893	10,688	10,895	6,664	4,550	3,348	2,486	1,623	2,129	23,391	4.5
Rural population	49,920	4,840	4,900	5,678	6,062	6,342	6,057	5,505	4,396	6,140	67,544	6.2
ESTONIAN SSR												
Tallinn*	119,342	41,427	40,102	28,393	7,229	1,593	409	123	42	24	253	3.1

* Including population centers under the jurisdiction of the city soviet

COMPOSITION OF FAMILIES

Distibution of Families by Number of Children Younger Than 18 Years of Age By Union Republics

	All Families	Families Having Children Younger Than 18 Years	In Particular Families With			Average Size of a Family Having Children Younger than 18 Years
			1 Child	2 Children	3 or More Children	
USSR	66,307,213	42,374,325	21,859,190	13,737,906	6,777,229	4.1
RSFSR	36,724,589	22,622,961	13,138,236	7,407,130	2,077,595	3.8
Ukrainian SSR	13,431,865	8,032,092	4,483,758	2,845,520	702,814	3.9
Belorussian SSR	2,527,274	1,574,785	802,394	585,730	186,661	3.9
Uzbek SSR	2,647,493	2,210,842	494,176	477,032	1,239,634	6.1
Kazakh SSR	3,293,878	2,465,447	963,396	775,652	726,399	4.7
Georgian SSR	1,150,836	779,927	288,451	294,483	196,993	4.7
Azerbaijan SSR	1,102,712	868,388	211,863	211,848	444,677	5.7
Lithuanian SSR	901,044	558,611	279,837	208,871	69,903	3.8
Moldavian SSR	1,024,397	669,052	321,287	223,670	124,095	4.0
Latvian SSR	685,137	391,360	233,307	128,176	29,877	3.7
Kirghiz SSR	702,678	548,769	172,928	142,361	233,480	5.3
Tajik SSR	636,402	539,076	115,170	108,011	315,895	6.3
Armenian SSR	609,372	481,216	131,057	161,075	189,084	5.2
Turkmen SSR	475,111	398,660	92,689	85,541	220,430	6.1
Estonian SSR	394,425	233,139	130,641	82,806	19,692	3.6

2. Distribution of Families by Types and Size for the USSR and by Union Republics

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
Urban Population USSR								
All Families	42,440,151	12,364,229	13,649,547	10,563,711	3,615,572	1,255,137	991,955	3.3
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	28,058,835	7,795,350	10,659,978	7,723,257	1,211,974	340,009	328,267	3.2
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	3,203,864	—	638,126	1,278,831	1,024,198	172,097	90,612	4.3
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	2,130,568	—	399,760	756,930	579,844	238,201	155,833	4.6
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	1,753,035	—	—	251,715	658,690	457,039	385,591	5.9
mothers (fathers) with children	5,316,738	3,950,629	1,097,797	186,394	47,646	19,787	14,485	2.3
others	1,977,111	618,250	853,886	366,584	93,220	28,004	17,167	3.1

1. Data on the distibution of families by types and size for the entire population of the USSR and by union republics were published in VESTNIK STATISTIKI magazine No. 11 and 12 for 1981
2. Children of all ages who live with their parents and are not married are considered a part of families

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
RSFSR								
All Families	25,559,771	7,788,167	8,654,553	6,273,539	2,004,138	573,059	266,315	3.2
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	16,813,077	4,839,371	6,793,978	4,487,551	541,429	96,483	54,265	3.1
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	1,989,540	—	407,413	850,102	632,945	79,262	19,818	4.2
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	1,196,626	—	235,476	462,361	338,585	116,468	43,736	4.4
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	987,111	—	—	160,150	423,126	263,464	140,371	5.5
mothers (fathers) with children	3,345,956	2,571,787	658,943	89,718	17,333	5,374	2,801	2.3
others	1,227,461	377,009	558,743	223,657	50,720	12,008	5,324	3.0

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
UKRAINIAN SSR								
All Families	8,213,954	2,541,953	2,689,311	2,094,856	630,655	180,471	76,708	3.2
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	5,620,041	1,715,969	2,129,855	1,559,423	175,475	26,754	12,565	3.1
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	608,100	—	137,331	248,766	194,552	22,909	4,542	4.2
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	379,203	—	87,126	148,833	100,363	32,487	10,394	4.3
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	340,812	—	—	54,880	143,867	94,439	47,626	5.5
mothers (fathers) with children	930,926	713,249	188,473	23,883	3,755	1,055	511	2.3
others	334,872	112,735	146,526	59,071	12,643	2,827	1,070	3.0

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
BELORUSSIAN SSR								
All Families	1,361,949	358,516	454,176	402,818	108,634	26,464	11,341	3.3
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	1,005,078	243,625	374,645	335,262	43,464	5,810	2,272	3.2
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	84,515	—	15,477	30,467	32,857	4,880	834	4.4
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	50,440	—	10,424	18,555	15,196	4,756	1,509	4.4
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	37,223	—	—	5,634	14,597	10,470	6,522	5.6
mothers (fathers) with children	143,265	101,679	35,791	4,820	734	175	66	2.3
others	41,428	13,212	17,839	8,080	1,786	373	138	3.0

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
UZBEK SSR								
All Families	1,224,342	221,658	240,140	263,596	157,062	114,372	227,514	4.6
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	723,145	121,886	162,556	187,570	88,171	61,262	101,700	4.3
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	91,564	—	10,341	21,076	23,289	13,095	23,763	5.6
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	98,382	—	10,344	20,417	20,592	16,512	30,517	5.8
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	97,002	—	—	4,833	12,144	15,982	64,043	8.2
mothers (fathers) with children	147,902	81,039	35,749	15,606	7,164	4,334	4,010	2.9
others	66,347	18,733	21,150	14,094	5,702	3,187	3,481	3.5

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
KAZAKH SSR								
All Families	1,923,686	456,597	556,160	509,178	210,117	89,662	101,972	3.7
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	1,259,750	281,633	421,282	388,629	97,668	32,354	38,184	3.5
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	133,679	—	22,059	40,604	44,116	14,140	12,760	4.8
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	131,744	—	19,133	36,388	35,469	19,702	21,052	5.1
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	71,792	—	—	8,328	20,162	17,920	25,382	6.4
mothers (fathers) with children	233,542	148,460	58,942	15,598	5,623	2,690	2,229	2.6
others	93,179	26,504	34,744	19,631	7,079	2,856	2,365	3.3

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
GEORGIAN SSR								
All Families	603,874	129,403	130,556	170,874	93,245	47,653	32,143	3.9
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	332,347	65,748	86,252	124,046	42,517	10,521	3,263	3.6
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	47,338	—	5,563	13,169	19,495	7,388	1,723	4.7
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	56,427	—	6,338	14,680	16,752	11,990	6,667	5.0
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	49,552	—	—	3,695	9,978	16,092	19,787	6.6
mothers (fathers) with children	71,916	46,524	18,266	5,622	1,096	276	132	2.5
others	46,291	17,131	14,137	9,662	3,407	1,386	571	3.1

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
AZERBAIJAN SSR								
All Families	626,961	109,435	111,331	132,899	104,110	73,852	95,334	4.5
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	367,805	56,995	69,474	92,560	63,823	41,471	43,482	4.4
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	45,056	—	4,799	9,339	12,583	8,189	10,146	5.4
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	57,568	—	5,634	10,992	13,221	11,676	16,045	5.7
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	37,828	—	—	2,253	5,673	7,965	21,937	7.5
mothers (fathers) with children	79,618	40,477	19,725	9,984	4,993	2,479	1,960	3.0
others	39,086	11,963	11,699	7,771	3,817	2,072	1,764	3.5

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
LITHUANIAN SSR								
All Families	535,425	151,754	172,229	151,368	43,881	11,458	4,735	3.3
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	382,332	98,554	137,417	122,279	19,392	3,420	1,270	3.2
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	37,207	—	6,839	13,485	14,027	2,373	483	4.4
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	20,185	—	4,642	7,278	5,362	2,107	796	4.4
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	10,447	—	—	1,644	3,653	3,166	1,984	5.7
mothers (fathers) with children	65,222	46,002	15,685	2,809	490	155	81	2.4
others	20,032	7,198	7,646	3,873	957	237	121	3.0

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
MOLDAVIAN SSR								
All Families	399,857	120,031	136,193	101,008	28,451	8,770	5,404	3.2
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	296,120	83,409	112,704	81,580	13,143	3,155	2,129	3.1
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	20,929	—	5,014	8,327	6,213	1,029	346	4.2
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	14,814	—	3,493	5,458	3,837	1,409	617	4.4
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	11,125	—	—	1,747	4,309	2,914	2,155	5.7
mothers (fathers) with children	44,604	32,488	9,725	1,758	433	121	79	2.3
others	12,265	4,134	5,257	2,138	516	142	78	3.0

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
LATVIAN SSR								
All Families	467,280	162,816	159,001	105,041	30,085	7,375	2,962	3.1
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	305,147	98,740	122,263	74,298	8,155	1,121	570	3.0
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	36,912	—	8,756	15,733	11,095	1,135	193	4.1
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	18,802	—	4,437	7,374	4,804	1,657	530	4.3
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	11,919	—	—	2,186	4,972	3,205	1,556	5.4
mothers (fathers) with children	71,213	56,563	12,834	1,472	244	61	39	2.2
others	23,287	7,513	10,711	3,978	815	196	74	3.0

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
KIRGHIZ SSR								
All Families	306,285	73,742	80,257	73,218	35,722	17,947	25,399	3.8
with one married couple with or without children	192,938	46,267	57,808	52,762	16,995	7,770	11,336	3.6
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	20,801	—	3,644	6,257	6,514	2,125	2,261	4.8
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	24,639	—	3,645	6,558	6,209	3,669	4,558	5.2
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	14,501	—	—	1,442	3,558	3,215	6,286	6.9
mothers (fathers) with children	36,686	22,844	8,942	2,708	1,108	593	491	2.6
others	16,720	4,631	6,218	3,491	1,338	575	467	3.3

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
TAJIK SSR								
All Families	265,978	53,648	57,559	56,782	32,331	20,154	45,504	4.5
with one married couple with or without children	162,265	29,784	39,494	41,744	18,013	10,877	22,353	4.2
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	18,220	—	2,408	4,448	5,073	2,256	4,035	5.4
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	19,350	—	2,375	4,159	4,311	2,971	5,534	5.7
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	18,841	—	—	1,036	2,592	2,888	12,325	8.3
mothers (fathers) with children	33,880	20,057	8,448	2,717	1,240	672	746	2.7
others	13,422	3,807	4,834	2,678	1,102	490	511	3.4

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
ARMENIAN SSR								
All Families	415,229	52,665	63,181	108,886	88,266	58,036	44,195	4.5
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	248,987	27,611	43,231	84,868	58,897	25,678	8,702	4.2
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	35,186	—	2,180	5,940	11,598	10,579	4,889	5.3
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	32,927	—	2,443	6,113	8,431	8,808	7,132	5.5
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	41,737	—	—	2,060	5,719	11,191	22,767	7.1
mothers (fathers) with children	37,780	18,782	10,409	5,863	1,759	737	230	2.8
others	18,612	6,272	4,918	4,042	1,862	1,043	475	3.4

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
TURKMEN SSR								
All Families	257,336	47,407	52,940	52,961	31,333	21,872	50,823	4.6
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	159,567	26,735	37,670	38,891	18,098	12,432	25,741	4.4
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	16,584	—	1,950	3,841	4,165	1,964	4,664	5.7
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	19,920	—	2,020	4,042	4,179	3,182	6,497	5.9
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	18,088	—	—	906	2,296	2,739	12,147	8.4
mothers (fathers) with children	31,134	17,335	7,309	2,850	1,526	1,023	1,091	2.9
others	12,043	3,337	3,991	2,431	1,069	532	683	3.5

9495
CSO: 1828/87

	Number of Families	In particular families consisting of the following living together						Average Size of the Family
		2 People	3 People	4 People	5 People	6 People	7 or more	
ESTONIAN SSR								
All Families	278,224	96,437	91,960	66,687	17,542	3,992	1,606	3.1
of those families:								
with one married couple with or without children	190,236	59,023	71,349	51,794	6,734	901	435	3.1
with one married couple with or without children with one of the parents of the couple	18,233	—	4,352	7,277	5,676	773	155	4.2
with one married couple with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couple and with other relatives	9,541	—	2,230	3,722	2,533	807	249	4.3
with two or more married couples with or without children with (or without) one of the parents of the couples and with (or without) other relatives	5,057	—	—	921	2,044	1,389	703	5.4
mothers (fathers) with children	43,094	33,343	8,556	986	148	42	19	2.3
others	12,063	4,071	5,473	1,987	407	80	45	2.9

UNION REPUBLIC INCOME DIFFERENTIATION EXPLORED

Moscow IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK SSSR--SERIYA EKONOMICHESKAYA in Russian No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 76-84

[Article by V. D. Zlatin: "Principles of Evaluating Differences in Personal Income in Different Union Republics"]

[Text] This article examines the factors of income differentiation, and it reveals the methods of evaluating interrepublic differences in average per-capita income. Evaluation of the influences of individual factors responsible for interrepublic differentiation of personal income permits determination of the principal ways of eliminating insufficiently grounded differences in incomes in different union republics, and further improvement of the planning of personal income in different territories of the country.

One of the most important problems associated with social development and with raising the people's standard of living is that of equalizing the standard of living in different regions of the country. The Accountability Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th CPSU Congress emphasizes the need for leveling out social differences in the territorial plane.

Investigation of regional differences in the population's standard of living, analysis of the socioeconomic conditions resulting in these differences and determination of the statistical methods by which to measure these differences make up an important direction of analytical research in the area of social development and raising the people's standard of living. It is in this connection that analysis of the indicators showing growth in public welfare, which entails evaluation of the principal factors responsible for these indicators in the different union republics, is important.

Further improvement of the planning of the public welfare in the different union republics will be promoted by implementation of the measures foreseen by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Improving Planning and Strengthening the Influence of the Economic Mechanism on Increasing Production Efficiency and Work Quality" adopted on 12 July 1979. This decree compels us to include, within the composition of the state plans for economic and social development (at all levels of control, including the union republics), general subsections dealing with the entire complex of measures associated with social development.

The specific objective conditions behind the existence of differences in the standards of living of individual union republics are the different levels of production development, different natural and climatic features and differences in the demographic and socioeconomic structure of the population. Solving the general problem of equalizing the population's standard of living in a regional cross section, we should keep in mind that while an identical level of income (and consumption) may be attained, this will not insure equal satisfaction of the population's demands in the country's republics.

A system of measures aimed at leveling out the personal income levels occupies an important place in solving the problems associated with eliminating significant differences in the standard of living of the populations of different union republics.

The main objectives of comparing the personal income indicators for the different union republics are:

establishment of the real differences in the personal incomes of the different union republics;

evaluation of the factors responsible for objective regional differentiation and the factors reflecting unjustified interrepublic differences in income;

determination of the ways for improving the personal income ratios of the country's republics.

Comparing the personal income indicators, we need to begin with the assumption that there are two groups of factors responsible for income differentiation.

One group of factors, the action of which is elicited by the objective features of the living conditions in individual republics, is responsible for unavoidable, scientifically grounded differences in the level and structure of personal income in the republics; the influence of these factors is constant and regular. In a number of cases the action of the other group of factors is insufficiently grounded; by evaluating these factors, we can reveal some of the disproportions in economic development of the union republics. Direct comparisons of personal incomes document only the quantitative differences, without revealing the nature of economic development proceeding in the union republics. Therefore the problem of measuring and analyzing the personal income indicators in the presence of evolved regional differences presupposes factor analysis of the important indicators reflecting the aggregate personal income of the union republics.

Revelation of the evolved differences in personal income and analysis of the factors responsible for these differences are the foundation for developing concrete planning indicators for personal income in different union republics. The results of such analysis permit us to justify the most important ways and methods of planning gradual elimination of the evolved differences in personal income in the territories of the country. Comprehensive justification of the planning indicators of personal income in the different union republics can insure gradual equalization of this income. Thus the most important task

associated with developing the basic planning indicators for personal income in the country's different republics is that of evaluating the factors responsible for differentiating the aggregate income and its most important elements. What this essentially means is that the way income is differentiated is the central factor to be considered in the planning of the indicators of social development and of growth in standard of living, as reflected by personal income in the country's different republics.

In many ways the inequities in the distribution of income among union republics stem from differences in the production structure and the social structure of the republics' populations. The sector structure of the national economy significantly predetermines differences in the wages of workers, and consequently the aggregate personal income of the country's different republics. The role of the population's social structure in determining income level is predetermined by the existing differences in income among the basic social groups: The incomes of laborers, white collar workers and kolkhoz farmers are different and heterogeneous. But our purpose here is to examine the task of revealing regional differences in personal incomes in general. Therefore we must analyze inter-republic differences in personal income outside the sphere of influence of social composition upon the personal income indicators of the union republics: The nonuniform distribution of income must be analyzed in relation to the population as a whole, viewed as a homogeneous aggregate.

Interrepublic differences in personal income are determined, first, by the corresponding differences in individual forms of income, second by the influence of factors associated with the heterogeneity of family size and composition in the country's different territories, and third by the particular ways the regional retail price systems operates. By examining the integrated influence of these factors we can dependably evaluate the existing differences in personal income among the different union republics.

Wages occupy the most important place in analytical research aimed at evaluating the influence of differences in individual forms of income on formation of differences in aggregate income. The law of distribution in relation to labor, which is an objective economic law, operates in qualitatively different ways in the individual republics owing to certain differences in the nature of labor. By revealing and eliminating the influence the factors responsible for formation of these differences in the nature of labor have upon wages, we can evaluate the degree to which the evolved differences in personal incomes of the different union republics (the wages of laborers in particular) correspond to the scientific criterion associated with the law of distribution in relation to the quantity and quality of invested labor: equal wages for equal labor.

When we examine the social consumption funds of the different union republics, we must keep in mind their unique status as forms of distributing and utilizing national income. We must also keep in mind that social consumption funds impart greater heterogeneity to the composition of income and the methods of its distribution than do wages. The main direction being taken by the efforts to study and plan the social consumption funds of the different union republics boils down primarily to justifying the income derived by the public from this source and the differences in this income.

The demographic and socioeconomic structure of the population has a significant influence on the income level and the differences in average per-capita income on the different union republics. Different republics are qualitatively heterogeneous in relation to the demographic and socioeconomic structure of the population. This means that the direction and the measure of influence of these factors upon formation of the indicators of social development and growth in the public's standard of living differ signficantly among individual union republics. It is from these positions that we must examine the role of family size and composition in the level of and the differences in the mean per-capita personal income in individual republics of the country.

Scientific planning of the most important indicators of public income in different territories of the country must be based upon qualitative and quantitative analysis of this group of factors and on socioeconomic justification of family composition.

Differences in state regional prices are known to have an influence on personal income in different union republics. Differences in state market prices stem primarily from differences in the conditions under which goods are produced in the individual republics of the country; in turn, these differences are determined primarily by natural factors.

One of the important objectives of analyzing and planning personal income in the different union republics is to justify differences in the prices of goods (and the rates for services) as a factor responsible for interrepublic differences in personal income.

The most important indicator characterizing the level of personal income is the wages of laborers and white collar workers. Therefore research on regional wage regulation is associated primarily with evaluating the indicators of their average wages.

The basic content of the law of distribution in relation to labor--that a certain proportion must be maintained between a worker's share of the individual consumption fund and his labor outlays--completely retains its essence in application to research on regional features behind formation of the wages of laborers and white collar workers.

Wages are planned and regulated by the state in accordance with the concrete objective pursued in the course of the country's economic development. Wages are regulated on the scale of the national economy as a whole, and of individual sectors; by regulating wages, we establish certain differences among different regions of the country.

The main objective of comparing the wage levels of the different union republics is to arrive at an evaluation of the influences exerted by certain factors responsible for interrepublic differences in quantitative wage indicators, since comparison of republic average wage indicators would not reveal the causes of wage differences. An analysis of differences in wages in different union republics would presuppose in particular that insufficiently grounded

(correctable) differences would be revealed. What we would do in this case is, first, determine the aggregate influence of objective factors on average wage indicators, and second, eliminate their influence on the wage indicators of laborers and white collar workers. In the final analysis, this procedure would reveal differences that are not in keeping with the objective assessment of interrepublic wage differences. An analysis of insufficiently grounded interrepublic differences in the average wages of laborers and white collar workers would allow us to plan the basic ways of eliminating them and consequently of making the appropriate corrections in the planning of wage indicators for the country's different republics.

The main differences in the average wages of different republics are determined by two groups of factors. The first group is associated with differences in the structure of the national economic sectors. The second group is represented by factors that make themselves known when regional wage coefficients are set (differences in prices on goods and in rates for services; qualitative and quantitative differences in comsumption of material goods and services).

The national economy's sector structure and the regional features of manpower reproduction are the decisive factors responsible for interrepublic differentiation of wages. Nonetheless, even after their influence is eliminated, a relatively high inequality persists in the wages of the laborers and white collar workers of the union republics.

The results of research on wage differentiation in different union republics can provide a quantitative assessment of the influence of the most important factors responsible for interrepublic differences in average wages. "Purified" of the influence of unjustified differences, this assessment shows that interrepublic differences in the wages of laborers and white collar workers are declining significantly. This means that the relatively high fluctuation of actual wage indicators is to a significant extent the product of factors brought into play by insufficiently justified differences in formation of the wages of laborers and white collar workers in different union republics. Hence follows the importance of eliminating those interrepublic differences in average wages which are not in keeping with the objective factors of their formation.

By appropriately correcting the indicators for the actual wages of laborers and office workers in different union republics with the purpose establishing the correspondence of these wages to the objective characteristics of the factors under analysis, we can map out the basic ways of eliminating the evolved interrepublic disproportions in wages. Thus the main goal of analyzing the factors resonsible for interrepublic differentiation of average wages boils down in the final analysis to determining the ways and methods of surmounting objectively independent differences in the wages of workers--that is, to revealing the unjustified (correctable) differences that have nothing to do with the objective factors responsible for formation of average wages, and to developing proposals on improving the planning of wages in the different union republics.

The conditions required for improving interregional (interrepublic) wage regulation can be brought into being by implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, which mapped out concrete ways of improving regional regulation of wages.

Further improvement of regional wage regulation and solution of other highly important socioeconomic problems associated with wages are the economic basis for scientifically grounded differentiation of the wages of laborers and white collar workers on a territorial cross section.

The results of evaluating interrepublic differences in the average wages of laborers and white collar workers brought about by objective factors associated with regional differences may be utilized in the analysis and planning of territorial differences in personal income. In other words they provide a possibility for answering the following question: To what extent is income differentiation associated both with the action of objective factors and with the unjustified territorial differences in standard of living that continue to exist today. Thus by analyzing interrepublic differences in wages we can simultaneously map out and evaluate the main ways of raising personal income with a consideration for the necessary elimination of unjustified income differences; all measures associated with improving interrepublic wage regulation will also decisively promote improvement of personal income differentiation in the union republics.

Distribution of part of the income from the social economy of kolkhozes among kolkhoz farmers in relation to the labor they invest is the most important factor determining the income of kolkhoz farmers, and it has a significant influence on interrepublic differences in personal income in general. But at the same time we should note that the wages of kolkhoz farmers represent a lesser proportion of the aggregate income of kolkhoz families, as compared to the corresponding indicator of wages within the composition of the aggregate income of laborers and white collar workers. This explains the significant role of income from private farms in formation of the aggregate income of kolkhoz families. Moreover the proportion of income from private farming within the total income of kolkhoz farmers is signficant even in republics having kolkhoz social economies characterized by high labor productivity.

Thus the basis of formation of aggregate income is represented by income from social production, taking the form of the wages of laborers and white collar workers, and the pay of kolkhoz farmers. This explains the fact that regional differences in wages of laborers and white collar workers and in the pay of kolkhoz farmers are a decisive factor responsible for differentiation of aggregate per-capita personal income in the different union republics.

At the same time distribution of income in relation to invested labor, while being the main principal, does not exhaust all forms of distribution of material goods and services in socialist society: Their distribution through social consumption funds exists and is undergoing continual development.

Social consumption funds are heterogeneous in composition. Part of these funds are a source of individual monetary payments to the population (primarily the unemployed population), while another part maintains institutions and organizations providing free public services.

Analysis of interrepublic differences in social consumption funds basically boils down to evaluating the amount of income derived from this source (the amount of the fund consumed), and the factors characterizing territorial differences in such consumption.

The demographic and socioeconomic structure of the population is the main factor responsible for differences in the average per-capita social consumption funds of the different union republics. Differences in the average per-capita income derived from social consumption funds can also be explained by the unique natural and climatic conditions of each republic. Interrepublic differences that have evolved in social consumption funds may also be explained by certain shortcomings in regional planning of public welfare.

Analysis of the income derived from social consumption funds and the differences of such income (calculated on a per-capita basis) in the different republics, as related to interrepublic differences in aggregate per-capita income, boils down primarily to evaluating the role of this important source of income in forming the indicators that reflect the total amount of personal income in the country's different republics. The general way in which this form of income is distributed corresponds in many ways to the nature of interrepublic differences in aggregate personal income. This can be explained by the fact that social consumption funds, which are an inherent part of aggregate income, represent a significant proportion of total income and are responsible for differences in this income. But this conclusion is valid only when interrepublic differences in these indicators are evaluated from the most general standpoint. More-detailed examination of quantitative differences in aggregate personal income and of differences in income derived from social consumption funds would show certain differences between them. In most cases the fluctuations observed in the average per-capita social production funds of the union republics are less significant than those of the indicators of average per-capita aggregate income.

When we compare the social consumption funds and aggregate incomes (calculated on a per-capita basis) of the union republics, we must consider the influence exerted by factors responsible for the differences in these indicators.

Such a comparison may be based on an analysis of the structure of social consumption funds. From an economic standpoint social consumption funds are distributed as individual payments of money to the population (primarily the unemployed population)--in the form of pensions, allowances, stipends and free services to the public. Such payments are variable in terms of their influence on wage differences and on differences in the social consumption funds of the union republics. A close correlation exists between the wages of laborers in different sectors of the national economy (average and minimum) and the sizes of pensions, allowances paid during temporary incapacitation and other money payments from the social consumption funds.

At the same time, being basically derivatives of wages (pensions, allowances), individual money payments to the public are typified by lesser differences than those observed in wages, and therefore they should obviously smooth out differences in income derived from social consumption funds, in comparison with wage differences.

Differences in the sizes of stipends have practically no relationship to differences in wages, they are insignificant, and therefore they can also promote relative equalization of the social consumption funds of the different republics in the country.

This direction of influence of these elements of social consumption funds is doubtlessly relevant to an evaluation of the way the personal income structure, which is a homogeneous aggregate, is formed (it would be relevant, for example, to a study of personal income differentiation in the country as a whole). But were we to evaluate differences in differentiation of income derived from social consumption funds and from wages in the different republics, we would find that the size of individual money payments could also have the reverse influence on differences in differentiation of these indicators among the union republics. In many cases the gaps in the level of payments from social consumption funds in the different union republics are found to be greater than the corresponding characteristics of wages.

The other part of social consumption funds--free public services--accounts for the wage fund of workers in the nonproductive sphere, the services of whom are provided without charge. This indicator, an equivalent of which enters into the total volume of the wage fund, has a disproportionate influence on differences in differentiation of social consumption funds and wages. This influence is determined by the greatness of the differences in the ratio between the average wages of workers in the nonproductive sphere (providing free public services) and the average wages in the national economy as a whole. An analysis would show that in the country as a whole the differences in the wages of laborers and white collar workers employed in education and public health are smaller as a rule than differences in the wages of workers in other national economic sectors. By examining differences in differentiation of the wages of workers in education and public health on one hand and the wages of laborers and white collar workers in the rest of the national economic sectors on the other we can arrive at conclusions on particular features in the economies of the individual union republics from the standpoint of development of the nonproductive sphere. A comparison of the republics in relation to the nature of differences in differentiation of these indicators would reveal that the fluctuations in the wage indicators for workers in education and public health are greater than those for other sectors of the national economy. This circumstance also explains to a certain extent the general pattern of interrepublic differences in differentiation of social comsumption funds and average wages in the national economy as a whole, for which relatively greater differentiation of social consumption funds is typical in many cases. In addition to a nonmaterial element (which is estimated conditionally on the basis of the wages of workers in the corresponding sectors), free public services also include a material public consumption element in the sphere of free services.

The extent to which this indicator differs on a countrywide basis is insignificant, being lower than the corresponding indicators for differences in wages. This circumstance predetermines the role of this form of social consumption funds as a factor having, relatively speaking, a smoothing effect on differences arising in the wages of laborers and white collar workers in the course of formation of aggregate personal income. However, investigation of the indicators of public material consumption related to free services in the different union republics would reveal significant nonuniformity in the distribution of this part of the nonproductive sphere among different territories of the country; this is why the possibilities of satisfying the demands of the population in different republics vary significantly. Interrepublic differentiation of this indicator is found to be sizeable in this connection, and it may be responsible for relatively higher differentiation of social consumption funds in general, in comparison with differences in the wages paid in the different union republics.

Thus differences in differentiation of social consumption funds and wages in the different republics and in the country as a whole can be explained by significant qualitative heterogeneity in the economic differences of the union republics. This is expressed in the significant differences observed in the sector structure of the national economies of the republics, in the manner in which the population of the republic is distributed over its territory and in the level of development of the nonproductive sphere (primarily free public services). As was noted above, the wages of laborers and white collar workers and payments out of social consumption funds make up the basis of aggregate personal income in the union republics. Consequently interrepublic differences in these indicators (the reference is to the resulting mutual influence of these factors in the course of formation of aggregate income) are basically responsible for corresponding differences in aggregate personal income.

An analysis of the way average per-capita income forms would show that even the role played by the population's demographic and socioeconomic structures in this process varies significantly in different republics, as was noted earlier.

Investigation of differences in average per-capita personal income in the country as a whole would show that a relatively lower load upon the employed individual (that is, a lower ratio of unemployed to employed members of society) corresponds to a higher level of aggregate income, wages and other forms of income, and that on the other hand a higher load per employed individual corresponds to a relatively lower income level. This means that the nature of the distribution of the ratios between unemployed and employed members of society in the country as a whole is responsible for relatively greater differentiation of aggregate income in comparison with the differences in wages and social consumption funds. This circumstance as well as the unique influences exerted by this load indicator on interrepublic personal income differences would have to be accounted for as a prelude to a corresponding analysis of this indicator of the population structure.

If we wish to thoroughly substantiate the indicators of the load on the employed individual in the different union republics from the standpoint of their influence on general differentiation of personal income, we would need to examine the composition of unemployed individuals. Members of the population outside the limits of the employable age group represent a heterogeneous group from the standpoint of its relationship to particular forms of income. The distribution of the number of children and adolescents among the country's different republics has the most significant influence on differentiation of aggregate income from the standpoint of the population's demographic and socioeconomic structures. For practical purposes this category of the population does not receive personal income, and therefore a relatively higher proportion of children and adolescents reduces the aggregate per-capita income and correspondingly influences interrepublic differences in income level.

Because the population structure has a significant influence on formation of average per-capita personal income in the different republics, and consequently on its differentiation, factor analysis must be applied to formation of aggregate per-capita income; this means isolating the economic and demographic factors influencing formation of personal income in the country's different republics. This is especially important when it comes time to justifying income policy and evaluating concrete measures by which to raise the population's standard of living. Given that demographic processes exhibit inertia, this approach can provide a possibility for thoroughly evaluating the results of particular socioeconomic measures implemented with the purpose of raising the public welfare.

Given the real content of personal income, and the need for scientifically grounded comparisons of income in the different union republics, interrepublic differences in prices on the most important goods must be studied. Zonal differences in state retail prices can be used as a basis for determining the corresponding territorial indices for goods in different republics. The task of analyzing personal income in the different republics in relation to the influence exerted by territorial price indices on the real content of personal income boils down, first of all, to revealing and evaluating this factor and, second, to reducing the personal income indicators of the different union republics to unified prices; the latter is achieved by eliminating the influence of territorial price indices on the real content of personal income in different union republics.

Territorial indices of prices on goods and rates for services must be determined in relation to the entire range of material goods and paid services used by the populations of the union republics. In the first approximation, however, territorial indices of state regional prices on goods may be used for appropriate correction of monetary personal income.

In a comparison of personal income in different republics, we eliminate the influence of territorial differences in prices when we analyze regional correction factors applied to the wages of laborers and white collar workers. However, the territorial differences in prices they reflect pertain not to the entire range of goods consumed in the republic but only that part which is equivalent to the dimensions of the wages of laborers and white collar workers.

In this connection full consideration of interregional price differentiation would require a number of additional calculations. Their essence boils down to the following. Considering that when we calculate a regional correction factor for the wages of laborers and office workers we account for the influence of territorial price differentiation in that part of personal monetary income corresponding to wages, we must additionally calculate the influence exerted by zonal price differences on the real content of income. As a result of the appropriate transformations we determine the influence prices have on differences in personal income in the different union republics that are not reflected in the regional correction factor.

Analysis of interrepublic price differences, which must be additional accounted for when comparing personal incomes, would show that they are insignificant and have practically no influence on the quantitative characteristics of income differences among the republics. This can be explained first of all by the insignificant differences existing in the overall level of prices in the republics (including differences accounted for by the regional wage correction factor), and second by the relatively low proportion of other forms of income (besides wages) in monetary personal income, which contributes an added increase in territorial differences in the prices on goods in the different republics. All of this means that any corresponding transformations made with the purposes of eliminating regional differences in prices would have practically no significant influence on changing interrepublic differentiation of personal income. However, all methods used to analyze and plan personal income indicators with a consideration for the real content of personal income in the different union republics must be based on full consideration of territorial price indices.

Investigation of interrepublic differences in aggregate income and in its basic elements and determination of the ways and methods of equalizing income are crucial to solving the general problem of equalizing the standard of living and insuring equal satisfaction of the population's various demands in different union republics.

11004
CSO: 1828/94

END